12-2007

A Structural Analysis of Higher Education Government Relations Organizations and Their Relationship to State Funding

Randall Brumfield
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO STATE FUNDING

A STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNMENT RELATIONS ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO STATE FUNDING

A dissertation proposal submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

By

Randall Waymon Brumfield, B.A., M.P.A
University of Arkansas, 2001
University of Arkansas, 2005

December 2007
University of Arkansas

ABSTRACT

Competing interests for state government funding have affected the status of public higher education as a budget priority. State legislators and executive officeholders are increasing appropriations to areas such as public K-12 education, health care, infrastructure, and social services programs at the expense of state colleges and universities. As such the higher education community must effectively utilize its government relations organizations to communicate with elected officials the importance of state funding. The purpose of the study was to identify the functional and personnel trends existing within government relations offices, and, to determine the extent a relationship may exist between organizational elements and state funding. Personnel size and functions were the primary focus of the study. Given that the nature of the study centered on state funding, an added emphasis was placed on the study of personnel fulfilling state relations duties.

Including the University of Arkansas, a survey was distributed among fifty-three major public research universities identified by the institution as a peer group. The demographic profile of government relations offices in the survey population is provided. Mostly negative correlations were found between personnel size and type, and levels of state funding. The lone positive correlation indicated that the portion of state higher education funding allocated to an institution was likely to be larger when more professional staff members assisted with state relations duties. However, a weak strength of correlation was determined among all relationships.

Exploring related variables, state population resulted in positive correlations of state funding. As well, over half of the variability in the percentage of a state's higher

education budget allocated to an institution accounted for the variability in an institution's share of the overall state budget. Incidentally, the percentage of a state's budget allocated to an institution was likely to decrease when the dollar value of the allocation was increased. As a result, additional questions may be raised concerning the influence of states' human and financial demographics on the results of government relations efforts.

Many of the study's findings support a call for additional research within this field. Whereas descriptive statistics have helped identify the organizational composition of government relations offices, further questions arose regarding their role in the state funding process. As a result, findings of this analysis can be used as a foundation upon which future studies can be constructed determining the characteristics or trends predicting the effectiveness of government relations at major public universities.

This dissertation is approved for
Recommendation to the
Graduate Council

Dissertation Director:

Michael T. Miller, Ed.D.

Dissertation Committee:

Kenda S. Grover, Ed.D.

Carleton R. Holt, Ed.D.

Jennifer M. Miles, Ed.D.

DISSERTATION DUPLICATION RELEASE

I hereby authorize the University of Arkansas Libraries to duplicate this dissertation when needed for research and/or scholarship.

Agreed _____
Randall Brumfield

Refused _____
Randall Brumfield

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Above all else, I thank God for providing me with the ability, perseverance, and motivation to complete this endeavor. Likewise, I offer additional praise for the individuals that have helped me achieve this goal. This begins with my wife, Christina, who has supported me with a limitless degree of patience, understanding, and selflessness. Without her encouragement, assurance, and conviction this reality would be little more than a dream. In addition to family and friends I especially offer my fullest respect and gratitude to both sets of grandparents, whose enduring support and devotion throughout my existence has led me to this point. For my mother, I share a profound sense of pride in knowing that her determination and self-sacrifice continue to serve as a primary influence in my life. From an academic standpoint I extend my warmest regards to the faculty and staff of the Higher Education department at the University of Arkansas, for it has been an extraordinary pleasure and privilege to learn from them. To the members of the dissertation committee, Dr. Kenda Grover, Dr. Carleton Holt, and Dr. Jenny Miles, I am indebted for not only the expertise that has been lent, but also for the sincere desire that has been shared towards composing a document that reflects favorably on the student, and, makes a meaningful contribution to the body of knowledge in the field of higher education. Finally, no words can completely account for the support, dedication, and willingness my advisor, Dr. Michael Miller, invested in me throughout my graduate career. His contribution to my future extends far beyond the classroom and the academy, and for his commitment I will always be grateful. His student-centered philosophy is a benchmark for the profession in which he serves.

DEDICATION

For my daughter Amelia, whose wildest dreams will also be fulfilled through faith… and those who believe potential has no boundaries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

The foundation of sustaining the operation of a public college or university is rooted in each institution's ability to adequately fund and support its expenses. These expenditures often include faculty and staff salaries, construction projects, learning resources, and utility costs among other items. In response to these fiscal demands, public institutions rely on income derived from student tuition and fees, private giving, government and business contracts, and non-profit grants. Most institutions are also significantly dependent on state governments to provide a source of revenue. For most public colleges and universities state funding is the single largest source of revenue available to them (Alexander, 2003; Cross, 2004). Without state tax dollars to support the institutions, many public institutions would not be able to sustain current operations.

State governments are spending an increasing amount on priorities other than higher education (Quillian, 2005). For instance, as a result of state constitutional mandates and recent public education reforms, elected officials are allocating more to adequately finance K-12 education than any other budget need. Second, health care costs and life expectancy are rising (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2006). As the federal government offers a 3-to-1 matching ratio for each dollar states spend on the Medicaid insurance program, politicians are prioritizing health care funding in legislative appropriations (Kane & Orzag, 2003; 2004). Third, funding for civil defense has increased as the cost for building and maintaining correctional facilities has risen. With stiffer sentences and growing conviction rates, politicians cannot afford to be

seen as soft on crime when making decisions to allocate resources. Other funding needs such as entitlement programs, road improvements, and infrastructure upgrades also continue to have an impact on state higher education appropriations. Consequently, rates of state spending in higher education will have to exceed spending in some of these areas in order to sustain the current level of service to students and the public in the coming decade (Jones, 2003).

Considering the political nature of higher education, colleges and universities employ government relations offices to articulate their interests to state legislators and elected members of the executive branch (Murphy, 2001). Hence, government relations representatives are responsible for communicating to these elected officials the needs of their institutions as they may relate to both fiscal and non-fiscal policies. The importance of the role these professionals play has grown throughout the past-quarter century as it has become more difficult to predict the decisions political leaders will make regarding higher education policies (McLendon, Heller, & Young, 2005). Additionally, each public institution often finds itself competing with peer schools for a share of the state budget; thus, the effectiveness of each government relations office becomes more integral to the financial viability of the institution (Newman, Courtier, & Scurry, 2004). A complicating factor is that new measurement techniques used for institutional assessment and formula-based funding will continue to play a role in shaping the public debate over the quality of higher education (Brooks, 2005; Martinez, Farias, & Arellano, 2005; McLendon, et. al., 2005). And, with state legislators increasingly trimming budgets and cutting taxes, public colleges and universities are finding themselves scrambling to hold on to their share. With less state revenue available to distribute, legislatures will be pressured to continue

reducing the level of appropriations that public colleges and universities were allocated in years past (Jones, 2003).

Therefore, it is critical that public higher education institutions become competitive in the art of building and expanding their influence among elected state officials (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2005; Murphy, 2001). Although a depth of knowledge and experience is likely essential to establishing effective communications with legislators, the structure of the organization in which government relations personnel function also plays a role in the desired outcomes of lobbying efforts. For instance, some institutions may choose to implement an organization with personnel focusing on both state and federal relations. Others may opt for building rapport primarily with state government relations, while leaving federal relationship-building to a dean or vice-chancellor of research or graduate studies. Also, even as some offices may choose to employ multiple individuals focusing on specialized tasks, others may choose to retain one individual that is responsible for all levels of government relations offices (Brown, 1985).

The personnel structure may vary as well. For example, at certain institutions a director of state relations and a director of federal relations may fulfill separate duties, whereas in others a vice-chancellor for government relations may share both responsibilities and report directly to the university president. At some institutions government relations professionals may represent a university campus, while at others these individuals may be responsible for representing the interests of a university system. Thorough analysis of these operational functions can lead to further insight on determining the types of organizational models that perform at higher levels (e.g. state

funding allocations) (MacTaggart, 2004; Richardson, Jr., Bracco, Callan, & Finney, 1998). Therefore, it is relevant to determine the effectiveness of state government relations based not necessarily on employee experience, but rather size, structure, and personnel responsibilities within each organization. These elements are important to analyze given they provide a snapshot of the emphasis and strategies institutions of higher learning invest toward securing financial support from state government (Murphy, 2001). Through such analysis this study intended to lay a foundation for future research as it concerns the organizational structure of government relations offices. In doing so, higher education government relations efforts to secure much needed funding from state entities may reach greater success with more effective government relations offices. Although a causal effect may or may not be determined, the discovery of statistical trends could enable administrators to consider new approaches to developing productive communication with state legislators and policymakers.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose for conducting the study was to examine whether a relationship exists between the types of government relations offices a college or university employs, and the level of state funding it receives. Focusing on the 54 peer institutions designated by the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville strategic plan, each government relations office was surveyed concerning size, function, and responsibilities of personnel. These institutions represent a broad cross-section of major public colleges and universities focusing on teaching, research, and service. As it pertains to financial data, information concerning states' general fund resources was accessed from a joint report issued by the

National Governors Association and the National Association of State Budget Officers. Fiscal information regarding general fund allocations to specific institutions was provided via an online database maintained by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Illinois State University.

Statement of Research Questions

The study answered the following research questions:

1. What are the organizational structures of government relations offices?
2. To what extent is there a correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund?
3. To what extent is there a correlation between the organizational structure of government relations offices and their institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund?
4. To what extent is there a correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of state higher education funding?
5. To what extent is there a correlation between the organizational structure of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of state higher education funding?

Definitions

For the purpose of the study, key terms were operationally defined as follows:

1. Government Relations: Government relations consist of organizations and personnel responsible for communicating the agenda and priorities of higher education institutions to elected and appointed officials of state and federal governments. These duties are charged to institutional departments, university system officers, and/or private individuals or firms contracted to represent the interests of the college or university. As it pertains to matters of fiscal policy, these professionals largely correspond with state legislators and executive branch officials when submitting budget requests to state government.
2. Organizational structure: Public colleges and universities utilize a variety of reporting structures to ensure that government relations goals are met. Specifically this includes all personnel, job functions, and job titles. More broadly this encompasses any sub-departments or branch organizations responsible for building relationships with government officials and communicating the goals and objectives of the institution. Furthermore it outlines the levels of representation for who each government relations office is accountable (i.e. institution, university system, state consortium, etc.).
3. Personnel Size: Public institutions of higher learning maintain a wide array of staffing to facilitate government relations endeavors. This includes the total number of personnel assigned to assist with these efforts regardless of full-time, part-time, or temporary employment status. Conversely, this does not include independent firms contracted by institutions. These private entities often do not disclose the number of individuals assigned to help carry out the responsibilities associated with representing specific clients, nor are job responsibilities and functions as clearly defined. As such, personnel size indicates the total number of institutional employees devoted to

carrying out responsibilities within, or directly associated with, a government relations office.

Assumptions

The study accepted the following assumptions:

1. The institutions of higher learning chosen for this study reflect a peer group that is diverse in geography, size, and history, yet maintain common goals, values, and visions.
2. Government relations offices share common characteristics in their organizational structure.
3. Although no two may be exactly alike, a classification system can be developed to categorize government relations offices based on similar organizational structures.
4. State funding can be utilized as a variable through which relationships or trends can be determined in relation to organizational structure.
5. The underlying assumption of this study presumed the values which influence state funding could be identified and understood utilizing correlations.

Limitations

1. The study was exclusive in that only data from 54 institutions was analyzed. Therefore, findings should be cautiously applied in general to the type of institutions included in the survey, which are major public research universities.
2. Colleges and universities were selected from the peer group established in the University of Arkansas strategic plan. Utilizing other standards or variables to

determine peer classification could have led to the addition or elimination of institutions in the sample.

3. The dependent variable in the study was limited to total state appropriations. No federal or non-profit awards, grants, or appropriations were taken into consideration. As a result data was not available concerning relationships between government relations organizations and federal or non-profit revenue allocated to institutions. The focus of this study concerned state government and public institution relationships.
4. Institutional fiscal data was retrieved from an online database maintained by the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University. The most current information for state appropriations granted to institutions was available from the 2006-07 fiscal year; however, a correlation study was performed using the current organizational structure of government relations offices. As a result some changes in office structures could have taken place since the time the fiscal data was provided.
5. Individual state budget data was retrieved from the Spring 2007 edition of *The Fiscal Survey of States*. The report was co-authored by the National Governor's Association and the National Association of State Budget Officers. The most recent data available detailing each state's general fund resources were approximate to final figures. Final statistics for the 2006-07 fiscal year was expected to be available in the December 2007 edition of the publication. As such, budget calculations may slightly deviate from actual figures when they are released.
6. The involvement of private lobbying firms contracted by institutions to perform government relations functions may have limited the analysis of organizational structure. Transparency of personnel size and type was anticipated to be more

prevalent among public institutions, whereas private entities were not expected to offer full disclosure of personnel matters. In the event an institution employed a lobbyist firm to conduct government relations matters, statistical information concerning personnel was not retrieved.

Significance of the Study

Colleges and universities are increasingly being forced to find alternative streams of revenue or cost-cutting measures to sustain operations while meeting the needs of rising budgets (Kirwan, 2005; Wellman, 2002; Zusman, 2005). Consequently, this often has a detrimental effect on college students, faculty, and staff (Johnstone, 2005). For students, these measures often result in higher tuition rates and fees and/or receiving access to fewer campus services, especially in light of federal budget cuts for student aid (Cook, 2004; Democratic Staffs of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions; Senate Subcommittee on Education Appropriations; House Committee on Education and the Workforce; and the House Committee on Appropriations, 2002). Concerning academic administrators and faculty members, it may include eliminating courses, teaching more classes, or doing away with certain degree programs altogether (Zhang, 2003). For staff members cost-cutting policies could mean doing without annual or performance wage increases, while others may be charged with the responsibility to help meet rising development and fundraising goals (even though levels of private giving have been found to actually decrease when state funding is reduced) (Gianneschi, 2004; Longanecker, 2005). As a result academic and administrative objectives are increasingly compromised to meet the needs of a balanced budget.

Second, there is an increase in competition for a shrinking pool of state resources. Kane and Orszag (2003) highlighted this by noting that state appropriations for higher education have declined $14 billion since 1977. Therefore, in order to retain or expand the percentage of state appropriations allocated to them, major public institutions have little choice but to evaluate their current methods of lobbying and influencing state leaders. If public colleges and universities are to continue relying on state government to subsidize costs for personnel, facilities, and services, then effective communication strategies could lead to an emphasis on higher education as a funding priority by both the general public and elected officials (Kirwan, 2005). As financial resource demands for public education, health care, and public services continue to grow, campus administrators are vested with the responsibility of making higher education competitive in the fight for state funding (Kane & Orszag, 2003; Quillian, 2005; Zumeta, 2001). Therefore, public colleges and universities play a pivotal role in convincing state politicians that taxpayer expenditures made on post-secondary education will yield as comparable benefit as those applied towards other funding priorities (Melton, 2002).

Lastly, colleges and universities continue to fight a growing negative public perception which took firm root in the 1990's (Harvey & Immerwahr, 1995). Increasingly viewed as a private investment instead of as a public good, higher education leaders have an uphill battle to wage in persuading policymakers that public institutions remain a top priority in the appropriations process (Cook, 1998; Coutier & Scurry, 2005; Gray, 2000; Ikenberry, 2005; Immerwahr, 2004; Johnstone, 2005; Malveaux, 2004; Pan, 1998; Zusman 2005). With many of their constituents asking for lower taxes, improvements in public services, and reductions in state spending politicians are often forced to make

decisions that offer a direct and expedient return for voters (Callan, 2001; McClendon, et. al., 2005). Unfortunately, such benefits do not always exist when government spends on higher education. Thus, it is incumbent on government relations officers and institutional executives to market the long-term advantages gained when public investments are made (Melton, 2002). In lieu of such items as lower health care costs, better roads, and new K-12 public school facilities that may be offered by legislators to provide immediate comfort and/or satisfaction to taxpayers, college leaders share the responsibility to articulate the social and economic prosperity and transformations a well-educated society can offer for years and generations to follow, and to improve the public perception of higher education altogether (Brooke, 1993; Hale, 2006; Pan, 1998).

With these factors in mind, the significance of this study was to develop knowledge to improve the stability and viability of public higher education. Through observing patterns in government relations organizations and trends in state funding, perhaps the higher education community can draw conclusions that may benefit each institution's own approach to communicating with government leaders. In doing so, this study could assist colleges and university leaders with making decisions that concern the structure of their government relations organization. Specifically, the results are intended to share insight that could better enable higher education administrators to make decisions concerning the type and size of personnel structure that may best serve the institution as well as the state legislators to whom they are accountable.

Through statistical analysis, the intent of the research was to correlate the personnel structure of government relations offices and the state funding institutions receive. The findings hope to shed light on whether institutions could be better served

through the adoption of organizational elements found in government relations trends. Although other variables exist that influence the success of institutional government relations offices, it was accepted for this study that the most comprehensive – and relevant – form of statistical measurement is delivered through analysis of state funding at the institutional level. Although it was not the purpose of this research to offer logic that reasons the differences in success some institutions experience as opposed to others, it could contribute to the quantitative foundation of any decision that could be made concerning the organization of a university's government relations office. If nothing else, the data hopes to raise questions that lead to further study and advancement of the effectiveness of higher education's lobbying efforts in state government. Doing so could ultimately be of significant benefit to not only those directly involved in the operations of colleges and universities, but all citizens who stand to benefit from higher education's service to society.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Although the literature concerning higher education's lobbying trends and strategies was limited, the dialogue concerning its relationship to state funding was substantial. In this regard the literature review includes: prioritization, competing demands, citizen attitudes, prospective outlook, and political issues. The majority of references included in this study evolved from peer-reviewed/refereed sources, research reports, books, and dissertations. Other literature was primarily drawn from periodicals and various publications intended to inform professionals in the higher education community.

The majority of literature was accessed through the University of Arkansas – Fayetteville Libraries. Specifically, EBSCO-HOST and ProQuest Direct electronic databases were consulted. Journals and periodicals were accessed through search engines on the Internet, including the aforementioned databases. Dissertations were referenced via Proquest Direct electronic database. Search terms for reports included content published by independent, non-partisan sources focused on disseminating information regarding the public financing, public policies, and public perception of higher education. The online database for the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education also offered research reports through which statistical research and analyses were provided. All articles, reports, and research studies were printed and organized for further review.

The review of the literature is presented in this chapter in three sections. The first section includes competition for state funding, including current issues and potential concerns that impact state appropriations for public universities. The second section

focuses on the public perceptions and politics that ultimately dictate the level of priority higher education receives in state funding. The third and final section examines the opportunities and obstacles that impact higher education funding, with careful attention to building support with government leaders as well as the general public.

Competition for State Funding

Beginning with the first state institution of higher learning, colleges and universities have met significant challenges in regards to public financing. In 1795 the University of North Carolina became the first state-sponsored institution to open its doors in America; however, the school began operations without state funding. In 1804 South Carolina College would carry the distinction of becoming the first publicly-financed state institution after $6,000 was appropriated from the South Carolina legislature (Geiger, 2000). Two hundred years and over 3,000 public schools of higher education later, the nation has continued to rely on state governments to help adequately fund operational needs, while depending on the federal government to provide financial aid for students (Smith, 2004). Nevertheless, despite the efforts of state policymakers to allocate over $60 billion in collegiate funding across the US, evolving challenges exist concerning the competing resource demands affecting higher education's share of state budgets.

The relevance of this topic illustrates the various funding obligations adversely affecting the ability of state governments to finance public colleges and universities. Public K-12 education notwithstanding, health care programs and social reform initiatives have prompted higher education to seek resources elsewhere during a time when state tax cuts have become prevalent. Findings by Archibald and Feldman (2006)

concluded that state governments, in lieu of these elements, have "allowed tuition increases that far outpace the inflation rate" (p. 639). Likewise, concerning federal funding, public colleges have also endured reductions from the central government throughout the last three decades. When amended in 1972, the Higher Education Act redirected federal appropriations away from institutions and placed it directly in the hands of students in the form of financial aid (Peerless, n.d.). These types of market-driven policies have compelled institutional leaders to be more effective in planning for the future of the schools they serve. Aside from grasping the variables that can dictate financial stability, it is critical for current and aspiring administrators to fully understand the conditions that will have short-term and long-term effects on the ability of institutions to meet the needs of their stakeholders.

K-12 Public Education

Adequately funding K-12 public education has traditionally been the chief financial obligation charged to state legislatures. Many states have provisions written into their constitution that ensure this, and as such legislatures have faced legal challenges when it has appeared this responsibility was not met. Allocating resources for K-12 routinely has ranked first in state appropriations, followed by Medicaid and higher education (Zhang, 2003). In 2003 states spent just over $500 billion on public education, as opposed to the $57 billion spent on higher education (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2004). However, this should come as little surprise given that state legislatures are more willing to trim higher education funding than K-12 education in times of budget crises. This could be explained by pointing to state politicians who "believe that public colleges can offset revenue losses more easily than school districts by

raising tuition and fees" (Democratic Staffs of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Senate Subcommittee on Education Appropriations; House Committee on Education and the Workforce; and the House Committee on Appropriations, 2002, p. 5). Zumeta (2002) agreed, finding that "legislators know that colleges and universities have sources of revenue that the other functions lack: notably state tuition, but also endowments, gifts, and grants" (p. 80).

Accordingly, it is no surprise that recent reforms in K-12 public education have also obligated states to increase funding to help schools meet the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Reported by Ehrenberg and Rizzo (2005):

> Between 1977 and 2001, twenty-two state courts mandated K-12 finance reforms to equalize spending across school districts... these reforms led to an average increase in K-12 spending of $340 million in these states. More than 25 percent of that increase came directly from reducing state higher education budgets to below the levels that otherwise would have prevailed. (p. 29)

Regardless of the added costs brought about either by NCLB or individual state reforms, legislatures are required to fund public education as a vital social program. Consequently, state governments nationwide must help fund school districts based on per-pupil spending formulas. However, despite the growing numbers of high school graduates in the United States, no adjustment is anticipated in state spending for each K-12 student (Jones, 2003).

Health Care (Medicaid)

As health care costs and life expectancy continue to rise, states are further obligated to increase funding for Medicaid (Kane, Orszag, & Apostolov, 2005). States can receive up to a 3:1 return from matched federal funding for every dollar they invest in the Medicaid program. As a result legislatures cannot afford to reduce funding for a

program that benefits a significant population and makes health care more affordable for citizens. Although this benefit is the second-largest recipient of appropriations from state governments nationwide, Medicaid appears to be higher education's primary competitor (Kane, Orszag, & Apostolov, 2005).

In a paper presented at the Ford Policy Forum, Kane and Orszag (2004) stressed the need for administrators to pay closer attention to the effect Medicaid spending is having on state higher education budgets. According to the authors' studies, as Medicaid spending by states increased twice as much between 1988 and 1998, as is typical higher education spending decreased ten dollars per capita. Despite the emergence of an economic recession, the growing population of elderly citizens and the rising costs of prescription drugs will continue to adversely impact the affordability of higher education. Administrators must play a larger role in increasing the size of subsidized student loans will continue to be the popular political alternative to directly funding institutions.

Kane and Orszag (2003) detailed the history, timeline, and future for the impact of Medicaid on state budgets for higher education. They found that approximately $8 is lost annually per capita on higher education as the current Medicaid funding trend focuses on meeting the needs of a growing number of elderly citizens. Furthermore, higher prescription costs and economic downturns prompt higher education to compete for a rapidly diminishing availability of public resources.

This competition began in the 1990's, when states were required to expand Medicaid benefits for low-income elderly citizens, as well as disabled adults and children, in addition to covering expectant mothers, low-income children, and low-income Medicare recipients (Kane & Orszag, 2003). Since that time it has been estimated

"that each dollar in state Medicaid expenditures reduces state higher education expenses by 6 to 7 cents," with funding for Medicaid increasing $20 per capita between 1988 and 1998 while higher education allocations dipped $10 per capita during the same period (Kane & Orszag, 2004, p. 35). In essence, funds originally intended for higher education are increasingly subsidizing the costs associated with providing affordable public health care. Aside from incurring the cost of expanding and adding benefits, the most pressing issue may lie in the ability to accurately forecast the future. As health care costs soar and life expectancy increases, more people will be requiring more expensive services.

> The share of states' general funds budgets dedicated to Medicaid has doubled over the past two decades, and now exceeds that of higher education. The share of the population 65 and older – which tends to rely more on public services – is projected to jump from 12 percent in 2000 to 20 percent in 2030. (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2005, p. 5)

Although higher education may not necessarily be in the best position to incur further increases in Medicaid coverage, it can educate legislators and state leaders on the fiscal lessons that have been learned from the administration of the program throughout the last 20 years.

> The substantial increases in Medicaid spending during the 1980's and early 1990's appear to have played an important role in the failure of higher education appropriations to rise significantly during the 1990's boom. The projected increases in Medicaid costs over the next several decades thus raise serious questions about the future path of state appropriations for public higher education. (Kane & Orszag, 2003, p. 4)

Combined with rising treatment costs, increased beneficiaries, and a finite amount of state resources to draw upon, the price of funding Medicaid will continue to come at the expense of public higher education. Unlike other public service needs, the ability of higher education to control its own revenue allows state leaders to make the politically convenient decision to divert tax revenue to health care costs. As a result, perceptions and

misinformation belonging to policymakers could prove as much of a challenge to change as the funding mechanisms supporting state higher education and Medicaid. However, if the attempt is not made to change attitudes, then higher education could see reductions that exceed the 2.1% decline experienced in 2004 (Arnone, 2004), a decrease that led to $1.2 billion dollars in state budget cuts for public institutions (Potter, 2003).

Social Programs

During the past decade, as Medicaid surpassed higher education as the second-largest item in state budgets, institutions have increasingly competed for resources against entitlement and social programs, including corrections funding. This is relevant to consider, given these obligations became more pressing for legislators to fund during the economic recession between 1990 and 1993. For current and future occasions this cycle is likely to repeat itself.

Concerning entitlements, Zumeta (2002) wrote:

> Demands for public assistance [will] rise sharply if a recession develops. States [will] face full responsibility for funding increases in the rolls... since 1996 federal legislation eliminated welfare as an individual entitlement guaranteed by the U.S. government. (p. 76)

Because states are now under this added pressure to aid those in financial need, higher education is penalized due to its status as a more discretionary funding option. In other words, unlike the ability of institutions to control / reduce enrollment, the funding of programs such as welfare "are driven by largely mandated responses to caseloads that tend to climb during recessions" (Zumeta, 2002, p. 76).

The prevailing sense by politicians is that while the funding of higher education can be planned through controlling enrollment, there is no definitive action that can be taken to control the number of people that are no longer able to afford basic goods and

services, or, the number of convicted felons that are sent to prison. In 2004, states spent 6.2% of their budgets on costs related to correctional operations, the fourth-largest state appropriation behind K-12, Medicaid, and Higher Education (NCSL, 2004). Though prison funding falls behind higher education in appropriations, evidence of stiff competition remains given that corrections spending spiked in the 1990's. Even as spending growth slowed for prison funding in the 1990's, yearly increases of nine, seven, and four percent occurred in 1991, 1993, and 1992, respectively. This was largely in response to states adopting "three strikes" rules, tightening sentences for offenders, and responding to court orders to improve prison conditions (Zumeta, 2001, p. 77).

The same conditions in 2003, war, adequate K-12 funding, and Medicaid, that attributed to budget cuts in higher education appropriations, remain a factor today. As indicated by Trombley (2003), the 2.1% decline in higher education funding is symptomatic of the states' response to an economic recession, military conflict, public education reforms, and increased Medicaid obligations. Reflecting this trend, tuition rates at two-year schools increased 8%, and increased 10% at four-year institutions. State budgets from the 2005-06 fiscal year indicate the funding outlook for colleges and universities could be on the rebound. The data reflect the biggest increase in five years for higher education allocations, with state funding increasing 7% from 2004-05 (Fischer, 2006). Nevertheless, repeated budget slashes have taken a toll on arguably the most critical resources in public colleges and universities. Recent observations (e.g., Henson & Raiti, 2003; Wellman, 2002) have agreed that hiring freezes, employee layoffs, and early retirement benefits were popular methods utilized by public institutions in responding to state cuts. Consequently, the decision to downsize faculty and staff further serves as

evidence that "elected and appointed higher education officers and their staffs in most states are... reasonably satisfied with the status quo, and are likely to prefer it over any proposed alternative" (Richardson, Jr., Bracco, Callan, & Finney, 1998, p. 12).

In summary, for higher education leaders to build momentum for their funding, elected officials must be convinced that improvements in quality and affordability can be achieved through larger shares of the budget. However, as state governments pick up a larger portion for public services such as K-12 education and health care, colleges and universities must be careful not to alienate either students or legislators. With the data-driven metrics utilized to legislate public policy, sufficient state funding may be best achieved through conducting trend analysis, dispelling misperceptions, and providing compelling arguments that draw on the significant short-term and long-term contributions higher education offers to society.

Public Perception of Higher Education

In 1997 George Connick, president of Distance Education Publications, prophesized:

> At the beginning of the twenty-first century, higher education will be in the middle of a major transformation... likely to be available anywhere and anytime the consumer wants it... the control of education will have shifted from provider to consumer (Connick, 1997, p. 9).

It appears this control made a shift, given that the student culture often perceives a college degree as a receipt of purchase rather than a vehicle to professional advancement. According to Rochester University anthropology professor Robert Foster, this perception is common among the current college student generation, confirming that colleges have evolved from developing "good citizens to good workers –and now to good consumers"

(Gray, 2000, p. 15). Viewed as a convenient retail commodity, Americans view the subsidizing of higher education as "dispensable and generally unnecessary" (Pan, 1998, p. 10).

This view of higher education has not always existed. For over three centuries the nation's colleges and universities (both public and private) have been viewed as not solely places of privilege or quid pro quo exchanges, but more importantly as communities of social progress. According to Newman, Courtier, and Scurry (2004), as the country has grown and developed so have the expectations that American society holds for higher education. Early trends reflected an emphasis by colleges to graduate enough men as clergy to lead the colonial churches. In the early 1800's moral development (of wealthy young men) was a common emphasis in college instruction. However, the Land Grant College Act of 1862 opened a new dimension of expectations to expand the study of practical subjects by bringing the knowledge and skills from the college to the community, which created significant outreach opportunities for the education of the industrial class. Nearly a half century later, formalized research institutions in the early 1900's emphasized the benefits of research, not necessarily teaching, as the primary element of public service offered to local and state communities. Followed by the GI Bill of 1944, great expectations were levied on higher education to help millions in transition from wartime service to peacetime jobs, thus expanding enrollment at public institutions and university systems at a phenomenal pace (Newman, et al., 2004). Throughout the 1950's the growth of nontraditional students exploded, as did the impact of technology. These events provided the impetus for the social changes that would be legislated the following decade in response to civil rights debates and

desegregation issues. During this period the nation emerged with affirmative action, civil rights reform, and a national dialogue concerning the direction of an equally contentious conflict, the Vietnam War. As Newman, et al. (2004) concluded, these discussions led to a more serious commitment by the federal government to provide broader access to college in the 1970's, when the introduction of Pell Grants and other need-based aid opened doors to students from low-income families.

As expected, the right of the campus to remain a center of debate emerged. What resulted from this long evolution is a broader and more profound set of expectations. Higher education has evolved to play a larger, more central role in American life and has become an essential part of the national quest for economic growth and social mobility. More importantly, American society has developed an expectation that higher education will serve as a central support for its public purposes.

The degree to which the public views higher education, positive or negative, hinges on a combination of variables. As described by McLendon, Heller, and Young (2005), "both the level of technical complexity and the level of public interest ('salience') associated with a policy tends to affect the *politics* that surround the issue..." (p. 385). With this in mind, a redistributive policy (such as funding) is technically simple and maintains high levels of saliency, thus resulting in much debate between political and social factions. However, regulatory policies (particularly those concerning accountability standards) are traditionally more sophisticated and maintain a low level of saliency. This logic helps explain the high level of interest from the public when the issues consist of financial concern (i.e. tuition, financial aid, institutional funding), but less so when the conversation turns to academic or administrative management in higher

education. Therefore, although Immerwahr (2004) concluded the citizenry is indeed confident in colleges and universities and retains a relatively positive view of them, peripheral factors not directly affecting institutional quality can skew public perception altogether.

The public attention paid to distributive and redistributive policies regarding higher education has remained constant throughout the past quarter-century. In an article originally authored by Tom Wicker in 1971, he noted "the combination of a general economic crisis and a sharp loss of public confidence – the two are not unrelated – appears to have brought the whole field [of higher education] under the most searching public, political and internal scrutiny" (Wicker, 1994, p. 28). Parallels can be drawn from Wicker's observation and the reality of modern times; finances mold the public face of higher education. Although it is debatable whether all socioeconomic classes of college students are categorically touted by institutions, the ostracizing image surrounding higher education remains. Tom Mortensen, a representative of the Pell Institute of Opportunity in Higher Education, summarized this concept, writing that poor students affected by rising attendance costs are "less and less present – and even welcome – in four year colleges" (Toppo, 2005). Unfortunately policymakers are less likely to radically change student funding policies as long as a majority of the public feels that students and families should largely shoulder costs. Immerwahr (2004) concluded that 69% of citizens in 2003 believed students should be financially obligated, a statistic further validated by Zusman (2005).

> Nearly two-thirds believe that students and their families should pay the largest share of the cost of a college education. Given ongoing access barriers, these perceptions may make it more difficult than in the past for historically

> underserved groups to enroll in a college, at a time when they are becoming a larger proportion of the college-age pool (Zusman, 2005, p. 123).

Aside from specific topics such as funding, the lack of general knowledge concerning higher education policy and organization is not only problematic for the average citizen, but it is also an issue for those who regulate it. As confirmed by Lemaitre (2002):

> While this difficulty is expectable in the case of the general public... it is also a problem for academics, policy makers, government officials and quality assurance agencies. So, at the same time that higher education is becoming an essential part of life for increasing numbers of people, there are no clear maps of a complex territory (p. 32).

Consequently, it is possible that those who are most instrumental in shaping policy and building consensus for public higher education are themselves adversely affecting its support. Incidentally, now that two-thirds of high school graduates are entering college (Ikenberry, 2005), without a broad understanding of higher education policies, political and civic officials will be less able to communicate the growing importance of postsecondary initiatives to the public. Lacking knowledgeable leaders to rally support, public confidence in higher education is likely subject to waver.

Therefore, the literature calls on higher education officials to emphasize to state and local leaders the social and economic benefits a post-secondary education can offer private and public sector communities.

> Although the value of a college education was called into question frequently in the 1970's, higher education has become increasingly recognized since then as essential for acquiring the skills and adaptability needed in the modern workplace. The middle-class social destinations made possible by higher education are now so widely recognized that they are undoubtedly the principal force behind rising participation rates (Geiger, 2005, p. 65).

Despite this recognition, however, a recent report by Immerwahr (2004) found that lower-income and many middle-class families are increasingly sharing reservations regarding access to college. Specifically, African-Americans are feeling that opportunities to earn a college education are defined by ethnic and social classes; whereas, Hispanics view that a college education is in reach regardless of race, but for only those who hail from favorable social classes. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that even though Immerwahr (2004) reported only a 4% overall decrease in favorable ratings for state colleges between 2000 and 2004, African-American approval declined nearly 30% (from 64% to 35%) during that same period. Thus, it appears the issue of access negatively impacts the perceptions held by underrepresented populations concerning the agenda of colleges and universities.

Overall, the pervasive feeling shared by the public indicates confidence in the performance of higher education, and views it in a positive light. Unfortunately, the threat of peripheral social and economic restrictions, particularly concerning rising tuition prices, seems to have an increasingly detrimental effect on the public perception of institutional quality (Immerwahr, 2002). As a result the public approval of colleges and universities appears to fluctuate with perceptions of access. And, for better or worse, the overall public perception of a college's primary duty is directly linked with career training. Conclusively, Ward (2004) tied these concepts together, noting that "the public lacks an adequate language with which to articulate the value of higher education beyond its role in 'getting a job'" though it recognizes the system as offering "the greatest range of choices and opportunities" (p. 10). With that said, until public higher education

changes its purchase price, its policies will be perceived as a barrier, rather than a vehicle, for many citizens who seek those choices and opportunities.

Although the majority of people still believe that students from middle class families have at least as much opportunity as other students, there is a growing sense that the middle-class opportunity is weakening. Higher education critics say that paying for college is toughest for the middle class; they argue that minority students and students from poor families can access scholarships, wealthier families can afford to pay the bills, but middle class families have too much money to qualify for a scholarship and not enough to pay the bills. Many of the middle class families have felt the impact of unemployment and layoffs and now have even less opportunities than in years past (Immerwahr, 2004).

Although the topic of affordability is central to most discussions regarding a college education, the concern is largely peripheral to many Americans. The public has been relegated to wrestling with many events revolving around terrorism, war, inflation, and health care among other things. Thus, higher education has not been a major focus of public attention. Nevertheless, this does not mean that attitudes on the broader values have failed to remain stable throughout the past decade, as reported by John Immerwahr (Immerwahr, 2004). The vast majority of Americans continue to believe that obtaining a college education is more important than it was in the past, that the country can never have too many college graduates, and that the nation should not allow the price of higher education to exclude qualified and motivated students from earning a college education. With that in mind, a growing concern exists by the general public concerning the opportunity to pursue a college degree. Specifically, the perception that access is

increasingly limited for aspiring college students is shared most noticeably among the African-American demographic as well as parents of high school students (Immerwahr, 2004).

In tandem with the topics of access and affordability, recent discussions among administrators and elected officials in Washington have also raised issues about inefficiency and waste in higher education. At the moment the public does not seem overly concerned with this issue. However, it may prove challenging to predict how these attitudes will change in the future. If the economy improves drastically, anxiety may diminish. Even so, there are indications that higher education may further be scrutinized should the economy show dramatic improvement. This could be particularly true if the price of college continues to increase. In times of economic downturn the general public may expect the cost of providing services to escalate. Consequently, during periods of economic recovery public opinion may grow skeptical of a higher education community that seeks to continue raising tuition rates. As Immerwahr (2004) foreshadowed, the country may experience even greater levels of anxiety when this happens. In response to the possibility of such an event transpiring, higher education officials should be prepared to defend the organizational and financial decisions made at the institutional, state, and national levels.

Building Political and Public Support

Observed by Cook (2004), the Republican Party, upon taking control of Congress in 1995:

> On the stump and in publications... sought to distance themselves from the academic community and contributed to the erosion of public confidence in it. As

> the new Republican leadership drew its line in the sand, the [higher education] community realized that its [low key and non-aggressive lobbying] approach would have to change. (p. 55)

With Congressional representatives distrusting academia, and state legislators and the public increasingly perceiving higher education as more a "personal investment than a public good" (Malveaux, 2004, p. 31) and as a "private benefit rather than a broader social good" (Zusman, 2005, p. 231), higher education officials were left to develop a strategy that would increase public support and address the rising demand for financial access by disadvantaged populations.

With tax revenue allocations considered as a standard of measurement reflecting the level of public support towards maintaining a "highly diverse system of higher education" (Johnstone, 2005, p. 373), elected officials and education leaders are more aggressively articulating the importance of reinvesting or redistributing public resources to state colleges. "College and university leaders who once spent the fall overseeing the start of the new academic year instead hit the campaign trail this season, promoting bond packages, scholarship support and budget issues" (Melton, 2002, p. 31). This is indicative of reformed behavior on the part of academics, observed George Mason Public Affairs Professor Toni-Michelle Travis, noting that college administrators "believe they must obviously and visibly support funding for higher education... [taking] for granted that the public understands where the money for higher education comes from, not any longer" (Melton, 2002, p. 31). This new attitude has paid off, as electorates have been persuaded to preserve or increase funding in various states. For instance, voters in California and Virginia have approved bonds that include financing higher education, while citizens in Massachusetts and Arkansas have chosen to sustain current state tax rates, and a plurality

in Michigan decided to continue investing a portion of tobacco settlement money in public institutions (Melton, 2002). Hebel and Selingo (2001) also pointed to the efforts made by Wisconsin and Ohio administrators to place a new spin on successful college budget requests, framing them as economic stimulus investments.

Despite this creativity, though, higher education administrators in some states remain facing tough political realities when tackling funding issues. For instance, despite Virginia's bond provision, Smith (2004) highlighted Virginia's tax-cutting agenda which could offset the gains made by the Commonwealth's bond initiative. He also pointed to Colorado's move to shift higher education funding through secondary accounts and discretionary spending. Such politically expedient decisions to cut state spending serve as significant factors for declining state revenue, and ultimately, reduced financing for public colleges and universities. In the wake of what is expected to be the largest high school senior class from the nation's public schools in 2008, states will struggle to fund public services as a result of unstable tax policies and stagnant economic growth. Given these conditions and a lack of increased federal student assistance, state and local institutions are resigned to raising student tuition rates and fees in lieu of public scrutiny.

Aside from the efforts of many elected officials to minimize post-secondary allocations as a point of emphasis in fiscal budgets, the aforementioned strategies are brief examples of policies implemented to actively achieve a common goal: to help establish the financing of higher education as a priority for state governments. Most fundamental of the logic to do so is the need to produce an educated workforce that will contribute to society – and the economy (National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2004). Not only can an educated workforce lead to decreased criminal activity

and entitlement claims, the tax revenue generated by college graduates reimburses their education costs several times over (National Education Association Higher Education Research Center, 2003). As a result investments in public institutions can indirectly reduce the costs associated with prison funding, welfare, and other public assistance programs, while also contributing to state commerce. Believing that the role of higher education can promote the development "of human capital essential to state and local economic development and workforce needs," the American Association of State Colleges and Universities agrees that administrators should take a larger role in statewide planning (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2006, p. 33).

Furthermore, it has been recommended that policymakers should also be made aware that private giving, statistically, cannot replace the void left by budget cuts. The perception exists among lawmakers that colleges and universities can adequately replace lost dollars by turning to charitable revenue; however, research suggests that donors will pull back on their giving if it is perceived they are replacing state funding (Gianneschi, 2004). Incidentally, increases and decreases in state funding often act as predictors for private funding. In short, when appropriations increase, donations increase (and vice verse). Statistical evidence indicates donors prefer to make contributions to institutions that are allocated large state appropriations, but changes in giving occur when state funding fluctuates (Gianneschi, 2004). Unfortunately, to the dismay of college administrators this trend seems to lack saliency among legislators when deciding on a budget.

Elected officials as well as the general public should recognize higher education's importance to society, its contributions, and the significance of an educated population in

the management of a free and democratic society (Quillian, 2005). It is also critical for elected officials to recognize certain segments of society aspiring for a college education continue to face hurdles such as poverty and racial discrimination. Thus, these barriers often make it difficult and/or impossible to succeed in the academic arena. If the promise of education in American society is to be fulfilled, it is essential that factors beyond the academy be continually addressed. Wellman (2002) touched on the importance of the nation and its individual states to make this investment. Conveying the historical and future impact the national economy will continue to leave on the state level, Wellman correlated the economic downturn with the fiscal pressure applied to public institutions. The "double whammy" he referred to concerns the decline in public revenue coupled with the increasing matriculation at public institutions. The ability to keep pace with facilitating quality academic service, technological advances, and growing demands on personnel is a challenge that must be met with creative and innovative academic, budget, and organizational planning.

As difficult as it may seem, it is essential that the higher education community remain sensitive to (and understanding of) the competing demands that policy makers face. Sensitivity and understanding, however, do not necessarily result in resignation. Colleges and universities are finding themselves in a position to remain diligent toward ensuring that the competencies and contributions of a post-secondary education are fully understood by the public and policymakers. Quillian (2005) confirmed this, noting that a concentrated effort to provide compelling evidence of both the personal benefits and the societal good higher education outcomes have to offer is critical to earning the trust and understanding of both the general public and policymakers. The higher education

community must look critically at its own practices and traditions and embrace changes that not only maintain stability of mission, but also improve the quality of service, while controlling the cost of the educational experience. This will require collaborative efforts of accrediting agencies, governing boards, administrators and faculty members.

In lieu of these efforts, the importance of communicating higher education's message is not solely for the benefit of public funding, but also the necessary policy changes that will enable and empower institutions to rely less on state government oversight and spending. As Potter (2003) observed, the trend in state governments across the country has been to cut funding for higher education. Although 18 states were able to increase their higher education budget in 2002, the nation experienced an average of a 5% drop in state higher education appropriations. To circumvent this issue higher education leaders are agreeing to raise private revenue in exchange for greater autonomy to enact and enforce policies with reduced state oversight. Budget cuts continue to affect students in the pocketbook and in the classroom as colleges seek to find new ways to grow revenue through such means as cutting programs, reducing full-time faculty, and relying more on technology to provide academic and student services.

In responding to the evolving needs of higher education, legislators and administrators are increasingly considering this move to delegate regulatory authority from government oversight to individual campuses. Oversight of tuition rates, admissions requirements, curriculum demands, and institutional accountability are several key responsibilities slowly shifting to the responsibility of college administrators.

> The clear trend of the past several years has been toward granting greater independence to individual institutions and relying less on central authority. This devolutionary process has been driven by... frustration with governing systems, and a widespread belief that decentralization, deregulation, and a free-market

approach would be more effective. (MacTaggart, 2004, p. 31)

As institutions engage in this competition for more dollars, the most meaningful change occurring may be found in their growing ability to set tuition rates. Given that legislatures are cutting taxes and limiting spending on health care programs and prison funding, institutions have little choice but to raise tuition in exchange for fewer state funds (National Education Association Higher Education Research Center, 2003).

Although many campus presidents desire to retain oversight responsibilities of tuition rates, bond initiatives, and business partnerships to sustain academic quality, legislators and students worry that such authority could lead to price hikes and less accountability (Hebel, 2003). Ironically political leaders are enabling institutions to deviate from their public mission to provide an accessible and quality education. As Zemsky (2003) noted, "the willingness of legislatures to encourage tuition increases in place of state appropriations... has helped privatize public higher education" (p. B8).

Depending on perspective, legislatures have created for themselves either an opportunity to capitalize on, or, a political dilemma to contend with. In supplanting budget oversight with reduced funding responsibility there remains no clear course of action that politicians are willing to adopt.

> At the state level, many states are demanding greater and more detailed accountability of diminishing state revenues... even as other states are considering reducing controls in exchange for reduced state appropriations (Zusman, 2005, p. 123).

On the other end of the autonomy spectrum, however, legislation has also been introduced that penalizes public institutions who raise tuition costs at a rate exceeding inflation. Ehrenberg (2004) was careful not to endorse this action, reasoning that lawmakers fail to understand that state funding allocated to institutions has declined

significantly (over 30%) throughout the last 25 years. With states allocating a larger portion of their budgets to comply with federal K-12 mandates and Medicaid obligations, institutions are relying more on need-based student aid while expecting less from public funding. As a result the decrease in state support has led to increased attendance costs, fewer research opportunities, and fewer tenure-track faculty positions.

This reality means higher tuition for students as states' priorities shift to other programs such as Medicare (Manzo, 2006), while public attention (saliency) remains focused on K-12 education, as opposed to postsecondary opportunities (Ward, 2004). Admittedly, there exists some dissent in the higher education community concerning the restriction of such opportunities as the most pressing issue within academic and student affairs circles.

For example, Hicock (2006) argued:

> Access to college is not the main problem. Success is. The retention rate for low-income and minority students at many institutions is much lower than for their peers; they get into college but they don't complete their education. (p. B48)

However, despite the attention academics and administrators may call to the importance of academic and student support programs, the issue of insufficient postsecondary financing remains. As Ikenberry (2001) pointed out, a quarter-century ago students in the lowest family income bracket receiving the maximum Pell award required approximately 6 percent of family income to attend a publicly funded institution; conversely, these same families in the 21st century must now invest over a third of their earnings in college attendance costs. Until effective efforts are made to increase funding for student aid as well as higher education operations, the issue of access will continue to be the centerpiece of the decline in favorable public perception and inevitably political support.

Summary

Public colleges and universities must effectively compete against other public service demands to garner a sufficient share of state funding. Tax dollars facilitate the quality of higher education, much like they do with roads, infrastructure, and, public transportation, etc. This was confirmed by the literature, which provided a common slate of funding priorities that public institutions must compete with for financial resources. The literature also validated this competition as a drain on resources for colleges and universities, therefore leading to higher tuition rates for students and their families. In turn, favorable public opinion of higher education wavers in light of less affordability, thus nocuously affecting the viability of public institutions to establish popular standing among elected officials and their budget priorities.

In responding to this cyclical dilemma, higher education leaders are prompted to devise strategies that will change perceptions among lawmakers and the voters. Although not necessarily negative in its entirety, public opinion of colleges and universities is declining in response to sticker price and taxpayer costs. An uninformed public may also be contributing to this perception. At first glance the casual observer may not view items such as healthcare and correctional facilities as having a direct effect on college affordability; however, the impact is quite significant. The increase in state government expenditures devoted to Medicare benefits and civil service projects are ultimately prompting institutions to raise tuition. In addition, higher education should also anticipate the effects of federal K-12 education policies, such as No Child Left Behind, beyond the secondary level. As states focus on meeting federal goals less resources will be devoted to state colleges and universities. As it concerns perceptions and policies the higher

education community is charged with the responsibility to work with lawmakers and their constituents to prioritize continued support of public colleges and universities, while maintaining essential state services elsewhere. Although various possibilities exist concerning state funding measures, public institutions of higher learning would benefit from their leaders building coalitions and diffusing misinformation among elected officials and the general public. Given these conditions, it is important for administrators to consider organizational approaches that would allow for the most influential means of delivering the higher education message to political leaders and the citizens they serve.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to examine the personnel trends within higher education government relations offices and their association to levels of state funding. Specifically evaluating colleges and universities the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville defines as peer institutions within its strategic plan, the organization and size of government relations offices serving these institutions were analyzed to determine whether a relationship exists between specific elements thereof and the state appropriations they are responsible for persuading politicians to allocate.

Although most colleges and universities may utilize a variety of methods to influence politicians, government relations personnel are formally charged with the responsibility to establish a direct line of communication with elected officials. However, despite their efforts to build support with legislators and government executives, recent trends have pointed to a decline in state spending on higher education. As such the question must be asked whether certain methods of administering government relations are more effective than others. Perceived by Smith (1990), "Influence occurs when individuals inspire changes because of personal qualities valued by members of the community" (p. 41). In this case the 'individuals' could be considered government relations professionals, and the 'community' consists of state legislators and executives. The vehicle through which 'personal qualities' are delivered evolves from the structure and personnel size of government relations offices. Therefore, this research intended to serve as a partial snapshot of the effectiveness of higher education institutions to influence elected officials based on government relations models implemented on each

campus. This effort becomes more relevant as legislative bodies continue to face public and fiscal pressures to adequately fund K-12 education systems, health care programs, social entitlements, and public works projects among other items.

Colleges and universities are faced with meeting increased budgets that include rising costs related to salaries, new construction, facilities maintenance, technology implementation, as well as other needs essential to sustaining a viable (and competitive) operation. Without sufficient government spending on higher education, students will be required to spend more on tuition to help finance these obligations. Therefore, the success of government relations personnel to effectively lobby for higher education on the state level is essential to helping hold down costs for current and future generations of students.

This study sought to offer findings that provide important information for higher education administrators concerning the organizational strategies of government relations offices. If more effective and efficient organizational measures could be adopted, steps could be taken that lead to increased financial support from state government. Results of the study provided insight into the current trends concerning government relations personnel in major public institutions and could help administrative leaders develop a plan for meeting increased funding goals.

The methodology used for this analysis will be described in this chapter in four sections. The first section describes the selection of the participants in the study. Section two details the design of the study, including an overview of the variables. The third section outlines the instrumentation and data collection procedures utilized for the study. The closing section is devoted to an explanation of the treatment of the data. Finally, the

chapter will conclude with a brief summary recapping the relevance of the study and the methods used to collect and interpret the data.

Participants

In addition to the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville (UAF), 53 institutions of higher learning were profiled for the study. Aside from UAF, these institutions are considered to be peer schools of the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville according to the university's strategic plan released by the chancellor's office in September 2001, *Making the Case: The Impact of the University of Arkansas on the Future of the State of Arkansas*. Appendix A contains a list of these institutions. All colleges and universities in the population are supported and/or regulated by a state government, are regionally-accredited, and award terminal degrees. The complete slate of schools identified as peer institutions by the flagship campus of the University of Arkansas System served as the population for this study. Confirmed by Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, and Sorensen (2006) "extremely large samples" are not needed for correlational studies such as this, reminding researchers they can assume a relationship exists if one is reflected within a random sample size between 50 and 100 (p. 380). This sentiment was also shared by Berman (2002), concluding that "many researchers prefer to test their null hypothesis on sample sizes of fifty to a few hundred" (p. 60). Both sets of literature indicated that extremely large samples can dilute statistical significance, while extremely small samples can lack significance altogether. As a result, in lieu of the narrow population targeted for this study, the findings of this research may not necessarily be applicable to all institutions of higher learning, but rather should most likely be limited to the colleges and universities

surveyed in the study. Nevertheless, in the effort to strengthen the results of the study, data analysis was delayed until responses were received from at least half of the survey population.

Specifically, the size and organization of the government and community relations offices serving each institution were surveyed. Doing so allowed for the number of personnel serving within each office to be recorded. This was referred to as the *size* of each office. Second, the primary level(s) of government each office is designated to correspond with - including the functions of personnel serving within these offices – was evaluated to determine *organizational structure*.

An individual from each campus' government affairs office was contacted concerning these two variables. The contact information was accessed through each institution's website. All initial and follow-up contact was conducted via e-mail communication. A common set of questions was asked to all representatives contacted. The data provided is reported in the findings.

Design

Participants in the survey were e-mailed a letter requesting the completion of an online questionnaire (Appendix B). This research technique allowed for objective data to be provided for the study. Specifically, information concerning personnel size and organizational structure was retrieved through survey techniques involving e-mail. Berman (2001) noted that in order for survey instruments to be successful no differences should exist between surveys, adding that unambiguous and non-biased language should be incorporated. In keeping with this practice, the information requested sought only

administrative data. The survey intended to focus primarily on contextual and statistical information describing the structure of an organization at a public institution of higher learning. Thus, personal information was not necessary for the study, nor was it requested; therefore, the nature of the inquiries minimized the possibility of subjectivity provided in participants' responses.

The questionnaire was designed on the Internet, which staff members from government relations offices responded to online communication (Appendix C). The survey was reviewed by an expert panel and approved by the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board (Appendix D). The information collected was used to generate data relating to the size and structure of government relations offices at each institution. Responses were recorded electronically via the online survey database, and were analyzed after a month following initial contact of the survey population.

Two broad independent variables were designated for this study: personnel size and organizational structure. Regarding personnel size three elements of government relations offices were analyzed. These elements include: total staff size, total staff performing state relations functions, and total staff devoted to performing only state relations functions. As it concerns the second independent variable (organizational structure) more specific components were used for analysis. These components include: total professional staff, total support staff, total professional staff performing state relations functions, and total professional staff devoted to performing only state relations functions. The number of personnel serving in each category was used to conduct statistical analyses. The objective of the analyses was to determine whether statistical relationships exist between each category, and, state funding (dependent variable).

For the purpose of this study professionals were designated as individuals charged with directly engaging in government relations functions. Examples of professionals included high-level and mid-level administrators, directors, assistant directors, or coordinators assigned to conduct federal, state, and/or local relations responsibilities. Support staff personnel were considered to primarily fulfill an administrative or clerical function. Individuals such as administrative assistants, office managers, part-time employees, and work-study students among others were categorized as support staff

The results from the questionnaire were compared with the calculation of two sets of fiscal data reporting each state's appropriations to individual institutions. This data was obtained and organized through content analysis methods. Summarized by Smith (1990) "content analysis is like straightening a closet; you find some boxes, label them, and sort selected items into them" (p. 256). In keeping with this theme, two sets of fiscal data for each state will be collected, categorized, and tested with three independent variables to determine patterns.

First, data outlining 2006-07 state appropriations granted to institutions was extracted from an online database maintained by the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University (Palmer, 2007). This information was combined with estimated 2006-07 state general revenue data retrieved from *The Fiscal Survey of States* (National Governors Association/National Association of State Budget Officers, 2007). This allowed for a calculation of the percentage of a state's general fund each institution receives, and served as the study's first dependent variable. This variable is depicted in Appendix E.

The estimated 2006-07 general fund data was preferred (in lieu of 2005-06 final data) for this study as actual figures were not yet available. This dataset was the most recent, which served as an essential component to analyzing current trends in higher education government relations organizations. Otherwise, this study would have been evaluating the current trends (organizational structure and personnel size) with data that was nearly two years removed from the study. With that in mind, the margin for error between estimated figures and actual figures was relatively small, given that 2006-07 estimates projected an 8.6% increase in general fund spending – down one-tenth of a percent from the previous year; furthermore, the annual expenditure growth for states the last 29 years has occurred at a 6.5% average rate (National Governors Association/National Association of State Officers, 2007). As a result, should a deviation occur previous history indicates the actual budget data will most likely not exceed 2.1% of the current estimated figures. In addition, the estimated data was published at a time when the 2006-07 fiscal year was drawing to a close. Given as much, total resources available for the fiscal year would have most likely already been determined before the fiscal year took effect in June 2006. Therefore most (if not all) of the estimated general fund data should prove accurate once final numbers are released.

The data determining our second dependent variable compared 2006-07 institutional state appropriations with the total funding state governments allocated to higher education in 2006-07. Both sets of information were accessed from an online database maintained by the Center for the Study of Education Policy at Illinois State University (Palmer, 2007). This allowed for a calculation of the percentage of a state's

higher education budget each institution receives from its respective government. Appendix F reveals this variable in further detail.

Concerning the validity of fiscal data used in the research, statistical figures originated from sources concerned primarily with decimating public information. The financial data for general funds revenue (reported for each state) was compiled by state budget officers providing data to a national publication. According to the publication the survey "presents aggregate and individual data on the states' general fund receipts, expenditures and balances" (National Governors Association/National Association of State Budget Officers, 2007, p. v). Regarding the fiscal data for higher education in each state, as well as appropriations data for individual institutions, the source was also considered to be reliable and objective. "The Grapevine project entails an annual compilation of data on state tax support for higher education, including general fund appropriations for universities, colleges, community colleges, and state higher education agencies. Each year... tax appropriations data [are requested from states] for the new fiscal year, and... revisions (if any) to data reported one year ago, two years ago, five years ago, and ten years ago. Updated state reports are entered on the Grapevine web site as they are received from May through December of the calendar year" (Palmer, 2007).

Data from both sources was calculated and keyed in a spreadsheet. The information sought determined two variables. The first variable provided the percentage of each state's general fund that an institution received in state appropriations. This was determined once the dollar amount for each institution's appropriation was divided by the total dollar amount of its state's general fund (Appendix E). The second variable that was calculated was the percentage of each institution's appropriation as a portion of its state

government's allocation to higher education funding. These results were reached once the dollar amount for each institution's appropriation was divided by the dollar amount awarded to all higher education operations from state government (Appendix F). These two dependent variables were utilized in a correlational study to determine whether significant differences exist in state funding among institutions that maintain specific personnel and organizational characteristics within their government relations offices.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

In summer of 2007, an e-mail was sent to one government relations staff member at each of the fifty-four institutions in the sample group. The body of the e-mail introduced the principal researcher of the study, explained the purpose of the inquiry, emphasized the relevance for participation, and provided the Internet web address from which the survey could be accessed (via web link). Institutions that did not initially complete the survey within ten working days were contacted via an additional electronic communication to collect information.

The questionnaire was constructed with the assistance of an online web development survey instrument. According to the webpage of the proposed website, the survey development tool enables people with any range of experience in data collection to create their own surveys quickly and easily, therefore allowing both experience and novice researchers the opportunity to make more informed decisions. As it pertains to security measures, the privacy policy published on the website statement affirmed it would not use the information collected from the surveys. The site also stressed that any

other material provided, such as images and e-mail addresses, would be held in a strict confidential manner.

Participants were offered the option to respond to eight inquiries on the questionnaire, with space available at the end to provide additional comments or points of clarification. Six of the inquiries required a response from those who partook in the survey. Copies of the e-mail cover letter and survey are located in Appendices B and C, respectively. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the organizational characteristics and personnel size of government relations offices at each institution. Those surveyed were asked to respond to a set of questions regarding structure and job functions. All inquiries requiring a response were done so in a multiple-choice format. Text boxes were also provided for participants to elaborate further if desired.

Using a scroll box, participants selected in the first question the institution to which their responses pertain. This assisted with tracking any duplication of responses that could have ensued, as well it allowed for follow-up with the participant if needed.

Respondents indicated the origin of government relations activities conducted on behalf of their institution by selecting one of four options: government relations staff (on-campus and/or satellite branches); university system (representing all campuses within a university system); private firm; or, other means could have been specified in a textbox provided. This helped determine the primary objective(s) assigned to each institution's office, given that certain responsibilities may have been assigned to other institutional or university system offices as well as private firms or external organizations.

Participants also shared whether the government affairs office they serve in is responsible for representing the interests of the: institution; university system; or, another option that could be keyed within a textbox.

Respondents were asked to select one of seven options identifying the primary focus of their respective government relations office. These options included: Local (only); Federal (only); Federal and Local (only); State (only); State and Local (only); State and Federal (only); and State, Federal, and Local.

The aforementioned options were also offered as choices participants could specify when recording the number of full-time and part-time personnel designated to each government relations area. These options were shared in two inquiries: one not including the tabulation of administrative and support staff, the other focusing on the tabulation of administrative and support staff only. This allowed for a calculation of the total number of personnel contributing to each government relations office, while also organizing data separating those directly engaged in a professional role influencing public policy from those who contributed in an office support role.

Other inquiries utilized textboxes for participants to provide additional remarks, such as expanding on the delegation of government affairs responsibilities (should an absence of a government affairs office exist), describing in further detail the structure and reporting lines of the government relations organizations, and/or providing additional commentary or further articulation if desired.

Data Analysis

Correlation analysis was conducted using Pearson's product moment coefficient of correlation statistical procedure. The research questions were answered using the following methods:

Research Question 1: What are the organizational structures of government relations offices in major public research institutions? Using content analysis and statistical analysis, the representative functions, government relations functions, staff size, personnel type, and various organizational demographics of government relations were determined. This includes common characteristics existing within government relations offices at major public research institutions.

Research Question 2: To what extent is there a correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund? This question was answered by correlating the total staff size, total staff performing state relations duties, and total staff performing only state relations duties with respect to the percentage of a state's general fund an institution received. Three Pearson product-moment correlation studies were performed. This method was applicable given that the study aimed to measure the significance, direction and strength between two continuous variables (Berman, 2002). The research examined the portions of states' general funds allocated to institutions (dependent variable) (Appendix E) in comparison with each of the three elements of personnel size (independent variable).

Research Question 3: To what extent is there a correlation between the organizational structure of government relations offices and their institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund? This question was answered by correlating total

professional staff, total support staff, total professional staff performing state relations functions, and total number of staff performing only state relations functions with respect to the percentage of a state's budget an institution received. A Pearson study was performed by analyzing the portions of states' general funds allocated to institutions (dependent variable) (Appendix E) based on the four components comprising organizational structure. In addition to the reasons previously outlined, Pearson's product-moment coefficient of correlation was applicable to this inquiry as "it is appropriate for use when the variables to be correlated are normally distributed and measured on an interval or ratio scale" (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006, p. 380). The research questions intended to utilize state funds as a ratio interval, from which dollar amounts were compared as percentages.

Research Question 4: To what extent is there a correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of state higher education funding? This question was answered by correlating the total staff size, total staff performing state relations duties, and total staff performing only state relations duties with respect to the percentage of a state's higher education appropriation the institution received. A Pearson study was performed contrasting the portions of states' higher education appropriations funds allocated to institutions (dependent variable) (Appendix F) based on size data. This operation provided the results needed to determine whether a correlation existed between the variables. However, it is important to recall "that correlation may not mean causation"; thus the Pearson analysis conducted for this question, as with all questions, sought to determine the strength and direction of a

statistical relationship that exists between two variables (Glass and Hopkins, 1996, p. 139).

Research Question 5: To what extent is there a correlation between the organizational structure of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of state higher education funding? Four Pearson product-moment correlation studies were performed. Again, this analysis determined strength and direction of the statistical relationship. In essence, the Pearson correlation coefficient method measured the association, or "goodness of fit," between the variables (Berman, 2002, p. 121). Like the previous research questions, this method intended to reflect how size and organization of higher education government relations offices 'fit' with the level of state funding colleges and universities receive. The tests analyzed the portions of states' higher education appropriations funds allocated to institutions (dependent variable) (Appendix F) in comparison with each office's professional staff, support staff, professional staff sharing state relations responsibilities, and/or professional staff assigned only to perform state relations responsibilities.

Pearson analysis was the most relevant statistical test performed for this type of study, as it was used to "indicate both the direction and the strength of the relationship between two variables" (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006, p. 148). However, a point biserial correlation was taken under advisement in the event the survey yielded only two values to measure for any independent variable. Having anticipated more than two values to be analyzed, the Pearson test provided the computation of the Pearson *r*, which determined whether two variables were positively or negatively related (as well as measured the strength of the relationship involved). This concluded whether the funding

differences between each group of organizational classifications (personnel size and organizational structure) share a positive or negative relationship, or, a relationship altogether.

Participant responses to survey Questions 7 and 8 were reported in tabular format (Appendix G). These open-ended responses were provided by participants to convey additional information.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided specific methods facilitating a correlational study drawing on data obtained through survey methods and content analysis. The research was conducted through the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville to determine whether statistical relationships exist between size and type of government relations offices and the state appropriations they may seek on behalf of their institutions. The research included data from 55 major public research institutions and the 34 states in which they reside. Organizational data for institutional government relations offices was retrieved via survey methods, while fiscal records reflecting state budget allocations were accessed via the Internet from academic and non-profit/non-partisan databases. Conclusively, this was not a causal study testing whether a change in the independent variable is necessary to change the dependent variable. Instead, the data obtained from performing the analysis was intended to test only for the general association between the independent variable and the dependent variable, knowing that causality itself could not be determined within the parameters of this study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Government relations departments have become an integral component in helping raise the funds for public higher education, communicating to state legislators and public officials the importance of investments made in colleges and universities. The strategy employed by institutions to articulate the public benefits and opportunities of maintaining adequately financed postsecondary schools plays a role in the delivery of such a message. In order to help public institutions develop success with this strategy, the personnel within government relations offices are relied on to be effective in their role to educate and persuade decision-makers in state government. The function, size, and personnel type associated with each office are elements that may dictate purpose and goals. Although it may be difficult to determine the extent to which these components directly influence effectiveness (i.e. level of state funding), conclusions can be drawn regarding whether a correlation exists between variables. Chapter 4 depicts the results from a study that examined the organizational structure of government relations offices and the state funding received by the institutions they serve.

The current chapter includes summaries of the research and the survey results, data analysis of personnel structure and funding levels, and concludes with a summary of the findings. Data analysis encompasses results from the five survey questions as well as percentages of state funding allocated to each responding institution.

Summary of the Study

The purpose for conducting the study was to identify the different organizational structures implemented by government relations offices of major public institutions, and to determine the extent to which a statistical relationship exists between organizational structure and state funding.

The study examined personnel elements that construct government relations offices at major state-supported universities. Government relations administrators at each institution surveyed were requested to share this information. Doing so allowed for surveys to be completed with the most accurate and current data, as opposed to relying on information extracted from institutional websites and academic literature. The results were summarized, categorized, and analyzed with state revenue data.

The significance of analyzing state revenue and government relations personnel is relevant for various reasons. First, the data could lead to analyses of trends and common characteristics shared by other institutions as it concerns the structure of government relations offices. The information could provide administrators more organizational options to consider when benchmarking the state funding performance of peer institutions. Second, comparisons can be made regarding the statistical relationship between state funding allocations and the personnel decisions made by institutions concerning government relations offices. Should administrators attempt to address funding inequities, conclusions from the study may provide a quantitative basis for advocating a new or different approach to conducting government relations activities. Lastly, the long-term purpose of the study lies within its intent to establish a foundation from which future analyses can be conducted. Although the research may not necessarily

result in groundbreaking conclusions towards the advancement of higher education administration, the findings may lead researchers to further explore reasons of causality for the statistical trends reflected in the data.

In conducting the study, the population was chosen from the strategic plan the University of Arkansas adopted in 2001. Fifty-three institutions across the United States were identified as peer institutions in the University of Arkansas 2010 Commission strategic plan. The institutions were all major public research universities located coast to coast in the continental US. Representatives from each institution were electronically sent a request to complete an online survey. Survey participants were offered the option to complete the survey online, or, delegate a colleague or staff member to complete it on their behalf. The completed surveys were automatically stored in an online electronic database once they were submitted by respondents

Survey Results

There were 54 universities surveyed, with 30 returning a response. This resulted in a 55.5% response rate. Responses were collected throughout a 27-day period upon transmission of the survey request to participants. No responses were removed from the survey pool, as each provided information that contributed to addressing the research questions of the study. Initial contact was made by e-mail to senior government relations professionals at each of the 54 institutions. The e-mail contained information regarding the intent of the study, a formal request for participation, confirmed approval of the survey by the University of Arkansas Institutional Review Board (IRB), and a web link to the survey questionnaire website. A follow-up e-mail was sent to those who did not

participate during the two weeks following the initial contact. All participants were informed they would receive an executive summary of the findings once the study was completed.

Of the 30 who participated, five institutions indicated they contracted with private lobbyists to assist with government relations staff efforts. Specifically, two universities contracted with private lobbyists for state relations, while another two contracted with a private federal lobbyist, with the remaining school contracting with private lobbyists to help with both federal and state efforts. However, all respondents indicated their respective institutions employed personnel who shared in full-time or part-time state and/or federal government relations responsibilities.

There were also some notable responses indicating a deviation from the mainstream as it concerns organizational structure. One respondent indicated its university system governing board employs a state government relations representative at each of its campuses; nevertheless, the option of employing federal relations personnel belonged to the responsibility of individual campuses. Concerning another unique format, it was indicated by one university that its system employed government relations representatives at each campus, but all partially contributed to system matters as well. Another institution confirmed it utilized current faculty and staff to share government relations responsibilities, thus employing no full-time government relations staff or contract lobbyists. Regardless of structure or responsibilities, many institutions indicated that executive officers within the institution, including presidents and chancellors, often collaborated directly with government relations staff.

Data Analysis

Organizational Structure

All questions within the survey were designed to illicit information concerning the purpose and function of government relations personnel at each institution. Table 1 shows representative function(s) of government relations offices, reflecting whether they are responsible for representing the interests of the institution, university system, or otherwise. Of the two reporting "Other," one respondent represented a main campus and branch campuses, while the other clarified it represented both a university and a system.

Table 1.

Representative Function of Government Relations Offices
N=30

Representative Function	n	%
Institution	21	70.0%
University System	7	23.3
Other	2	6.6

Table 2 shows a list of governmental relations responsibilities as reported by each institution. The institution reporting "Other" indicated that it maintained separate state and federal government relations offices; however, they reported to separate administrative divisions.

Table 2.

Government Relations Function of Institutions
N=30

Government Relations Functions	n	%
Federal, State, and Local	11	36.6%
Federal and State	12	40.0
State and Local	3	10.0
State	3	10.0
Other	1	3.33

Table 3 shows the combination of representative function and government relations responsibilities as reported by each institution.

Table 3.

Summary of Government Relations Functions by Representative Functions
N=30

	Institution	University System	Other
Federal, State, and Local	6	3	2
Federal and State	9	3	0
State and Local	3	0	0
State	2	1	0
Other	1	0	0
Total	21	7	2

Survey participants were asked to indicate the number of full-time and part-time professional and office support staff serving in a government relations role. All but one institution responded that office support was performed for government relations functions. Respondents were asked to categorize each staff member's duties as it related to government relations functions (i.e. federal and state, state, local, etc.). Table 4 reflects specific respondent information for professional staff. In other words, the table shows the total number of professionals assigned to each type of government relations responsibility at each institution.

Table 4.

Summary of Professional Personnel Responsibilities
N=30

Respondent #	Federal/State/Local	Federal/State	State/Local	Federal	State	Local
1				2	1	2
2				2	2	1
3					3	
4				3	3	
5					3	
6		1		0.20	0.10	
7	2			1	1	
8				0.50	3	1
9				0.40	0.60	
10				1	4.50	1
11				2	1	

(table continues)

Table 4. (continued)

Summary of Professional Personnel Responsibilities
N=30

Respondent #	Federal/State/Local	Federal/State	State/Local	Federal	State	Local
12		2		1	1	
13				0.25	2	
14				0.30	1	1
15				1	1	
16		1				
17				3	5	4
18				1	3	
19				1	1	
20		2.50		1		
21		1		1	5	
22				1	1	
23		1.50				
24				2.5	2	5
25				1	1	
26		1				
27				2	3	
28				1.5	5	
29	0.50					
30			1	1	1	
Total	2.50	10	1	30.65	54.20	15

In total, state, federal, and/or local government relations responsibilities were shared among 113.5 professionals from the 30 institutions who participated in the survey. First among these, almost 48% were professionals assigned to state-only duties, followed by the 27% who fulfilled federal-only duties. Proportionally, not as many professionals combined federal, state, and/or local government relations responsibilities. Table 5 illustrates the distribution of administrative staff duties.

Table 5.

Summary of Support Staff Personnel Responsibilities
N=30

Respondent #	Federal/State/Local	Federal/State	State/Local	Federal	State	Local
1				1	2	0.50
2				1	1	
3			2			
4					1	
5					2	
6		0.50				
7				0.25	1	
8				0.35	1.5	1
9				0.30	0.60	
10				0.50	2	0.50
11		1				
12		1.5		1	1	
13				0.25	3	

(table continues)

Table 5. (continued)

Summary of Support Staff Personnel Responsibilities
N=30

Respondent #	Federal/State/Local	Federal/State	State/Local	Federal	State	Local
14				0.30	2	2
15	0.75					
16						
17				1	1	1
18				0.50	2	
19				1	1	
20				2	3	
21		2				
22		1				
23		0.30				
24	2.5					
25		1				
26		1				
27				1	2.50	
28				1	4	
29	0.50					
30			0.80			
Total	3.75	8.30	2.80	11.45	30.60	5

A total of 61.9 full-time and part-time employees contributed to administrative and clerical staff functions supporting government relations functions. This is 64% less than government relations personnel employed to conduct professional duties. Again, staff designated for state-only duties led all categories by comprising 49% of the population, with federal-only a distant second at 18%. However, a higher percentage of support staff (24%) shared combined responsibilities (federal, state, and/or local) as opposed to professional staff (14.8%).

Research Questions

Research Question #1: What were the organizational structures of government relations offices in major public research institutions?

Based on the demographical data received, government relations offices serving major public research universities typically support a university (70%) as opposed to a university system (Table 1). As reflected in Table 2, 76% of government relations offices maintained both state and federal responsibilities. These functions were also most likely to be assumed by offices serving either individual institutions or university systems (Table 2). Only 20% of government relations offices fulfilled state relations responsibilities without maintaining federal relations duties.

For staffing, the average staff size for a government relations office was 5.84. The average professional staff size was 3.77, with 2.25 engaging in state relations responsibilities. Offices maintained an average personnel size of 1.80 professional staff members assigned to state relations only. Concerning administrative support personnel, offices maintained an average of 1.63 staff members.

Nearly half (48%) of all professional and administrative employees served in capacities devoted solely to state relations functions. Comparatively, 24% of government relations personnel were designated to fulfill only federal relations functions. Among all staff personnel, fewer than 14% fulfilled responsibilities serving multiple levels of government relations (federal, state, and local).

This trend continued along professional and administrative lines. Among professionals, only 14% conducted duties for combined levels of government relations, as did only 24% of administrative support staff. Within the professional group, 48% subscribed solely to state relations duties, while 49% did so among the office administrative ranks. Again, personnel who were assigned to fulfill only federal relations duties were second most populous, comprising 27% of professional staff and 18% of support staff.

In summary, although there are several combinations upon which government relations offices can be organized, there appeared to be a common set of characteristics prevailing among the majority of institutions. First, government relations offices largely served individual institutions as opposed to university systems. Second, government relations offices were likely to engage in both state and federal relations responsibilities. Next, personnel size usually consists of approximately five or six staff members, usually consisting of 3-4 professional staff, of which two were fully or partially responsible for state relations duties. In addition, one or two office support staff may assist with administrative responsibilities. Lastly, the majority of personnel served a devoted function, with the majority of professional and administrative staff carrying out duties devoted entirely to either state relations or federal relations, but not both.

Research Question #2: To what extent was there a correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund?

Using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, it was determined that a negative correlation existed between the number of government relations personnel and the overall percentage of state funding an institution received. (Funding data for all institutions surveyed is located in Appendices E and F). In other words, the percentage of state funding received is higher for government relations offices served by fewer personnel. However, the strength of the correlation between the two variables was significantly weak. As seen in Tables 6-8, between 3% and 8% of the variability in the percentage of state funding was associated with the total number of staff (r^2). In summary, the percentage of funding received maintained a negative statistical correlation with the total number of overall staff, staff performing state relations functions, and staff performing only state relations functions. With that said, the three independent variables have little or no effect on the percentage of overall state funding an institution was allocated.

Table 6.

Correlation of Total Staff and State Budget Percent (Percentage of State Budget)
N=30

	Total Staff	% State Budget
Mean	5.84	2.01%
Variance	12.2	1.59
Standard Deviation	3.50	1.26
$r = -0.285$		
$r^2 = 0.081$		

The average total number of staff maintained for government relations personnel equated to under six per office. On average, 2% of a state's budget was allocated to the universities participating in the survey.

Table 7.

Correlation of Total State-Related Staff and State Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Related Staff	% State Budget
Mean	3.77	2.01%
Variance	4.37	1.59
Standard Deviation	2.09	1.26
$r = -0.178$		
$r^2 = 0.032$		

Table 8.

Correlation of Total State-Only Staff and State Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Only Staff	% State Budget
Mean	2.76	2.01%
Variance	5.54	1.59
Standard Deviation	2.35	1.26
$r = -0.207$		
$r^2 = 0.043$		

In Table 8 the correlation coefficient (r) is calculated at -0.207, thus indicating a negative direction of the correlation. The coefficient of determination (r^2) is calculated at r^2=.043, therefore determining only 4.3% of the variability in the percentage of state budget allocations were linked with the variability in the number of staff an office employs to fulfill only state relations functions. As a result, the strength of the correlation is weak.

Research Question #3: To what extent was there a correlation between the organizational structure of government relations offices and their institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund?

As it concerns organizational structure, the type (and size) of personnel serving in a government relations office has minimal bearing on the percentage of a state's budget an institution receives. Tables 9-12 reflect strength of correlation between 0.3% and 3.5%. The statistical correlation between the variables was negative.

Table 9 provides the correlation data for the total number of professional staff serving in an office, and the percentage of a state budget institutions receive.

Table 9.

Correlation of Professional Staff and State Budget Percent
N=30

	Professional Staff	% State Budget
Mean	3.77	2.01%
Variance	6.91	1.59
Standard Deviation	2.62	1.26
$r = -0.184$		
$r^2 = 0.034$		

Statistical analysis of office support staff and state budget share is located in Table 10. Clerical, administrative, and non-professional personnel comprise support staff.

Table 10.

Correlation of Support Staff and State Budget Percent
n=30

	Support Staff	% State Budget
Mean	2.26	2.01%
Variance	2.68	1.59
Standard Deviation	1.63	1.26
$r = -0.187$		
$r^2 = 0.035$		

Data analysis in Table 11 correlates the number of professional personnel engaged in state relations with the portion of state funding institutions receive.

Table 11.

Correlation of State-Related Professional Staff and State Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Related Professional Staff	% State Budget
Mean	2.25	2.01%
Variance	2.09	1.59
Standard Deviation	1.44	1.26
$r = -0.052$		
$r^2 = 0.003$		

Table 12 depicts the average number of professional staff devoted solely to state relations. This data was correlated with the percentage of state budgets belonging to the institution.

Table 12.

Correlation of State-Only Professional Staff and State Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Only Professional Staff	% State Budget
Mean	1.80	2.01%
Variance	2.54	145
Standard Deviation	1.59	1.26
$r = -0.127$		
$r^2 = 0.016$		

Research Question #4: To what extent was there a correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of state higher education funding?

Continuing the trend of the previous research questions, a negative statistical correlation existed between the personnel size of government relations offices and the percentage of a state's higher education budget an institution receives. In addition, the strength of the correlation was weak among the variables. Thus, as personnel size increases, the percentage of state higher education funding allocated decreases; however, according to Tables 13-15 only 0.1% to 4.3% of the variability in funding is associated with the variability of staff size.

As noted in the tables below, institutions receive on average 17.6% of their state's higher education budget. Table 16 correlates total staff size with the percentage of a state's higher education budget institutions receive.

Table 13.

Correlation of Total Staff and State Higher Education (HIED) Budget Percent (Percentage of State HIED Budget)
N=30

	Total Staff	% State HIED Budget
Mean	5.84	17.6%
Variance	12.2	145
Standard Deviation	3.50	12.0
$r = -0.208$		
$r^2 = 0.043$		

Outlined in Table 14, a correlation of the number of state-related staff in a government relations office was compared with the portion of state higher education funding received.

Table 14.

Correlation of State-Related Staff and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Related Staff	% State HIED Budget
Mean	3.77	17.6%
Variance	4.37	145
Standard Deviation	2.09	12.0
$r = -0.031$		
$r^2 = 0.001$		

Table 15 reflects the total number of staff devoted only to state-related functions correlated with the percentage of a state's higher education budget allocated to an institution.

Table 15.

Correlation of Total State-Only Staff and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Only Staff	% State HIED Budget
Mean	2.76	17.6%
Variance	5.54	145
Standard Deviation	2.35	12.0
$r = -0.097$		
$r^2 = 0.009$		

Research Question #5: To what extent was there a correlation between the organizational structure of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of state higher education funding?

The correlation between the two variables was mostly negative and weak. The smaller the total number of professional staff, professional staff devoted solely to state relations, and all support staff serving in a government relations office, the increase in share of the state higher education budget an institution was likely to receive. The exception to this trend involved an analysis of all professional staff personnel fulfilling state relations duties (Table 18). Regardless, the variability in the type of personnel serving in a government relations office affected only between .01% and 2.7% of the percentage of a state's higher education budget an institution receives.

Provided below is an analysis of the number of professional staff serving in a government relations office, and the share of the state higher education budget received.

Table 16.

Correlation of Professional Staff and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	Professional Staff	% State HIED Budget
Mean	3.77	17.6%
Variance	6.91	145
Standard Deviation	2.62	12.0
r = -0.141		
$r^2 = 0.02$		

In Table 17 results indicate a weak relationship between support staff and percentage of a state's higher education budget.

Table 17.

Correlation of Support Staff and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	Support Staff	% State HIED Budget
Mean	2.26	17.6%
Variance	2.68	145
Standard Deviation	1.63	12.0
r = -0.164		
$r^2 = 0.027$		

Unlike previous analyses, a positive correlation existed between the number of state-related professional staff and the share of a state's higher education budget an institution was allocated (Table 18). Statistically, the percentage of a state's higher education budget allocated to an institution was more likely to be higher when the number of professional staff contributing to state relations duties was increased.

Table 18.

Correlation of State-Related Professional Staff and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Related Professional Staff	% State HIED Budget
Mean	2.25	17.6%
Variance	2.09	145
Standard Deviation	1.44	12.04
$r = 0.034$		
$r^2 = 0.001$		

Table 19 returns to the common trend, reflecting data that indicated institutions with fewer personnel devoted solely to state relations duties received a larger share of the state higher education budget.

Table 19.

Correlation of State-Only Professional Staff and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	State-Only Professional Staff	% State HIED Budget
Mean	1.80	17.6%
Variance	2.54	145
Standard Deviation	1.59	12.0
$r = -0.037$		
$r^2 = 0.001$		

Given that 13 of the 14 analyses performed for the research questions resulted in negative correlations, with all 14 calculated as weak coefficient measures, questions arose from these results. Several calculations were performed to further explore potential relationships and trends. These analyses were conducted to possibly allow for further explanation of the negative correlations (if not the weak relationships altogether), and to help identify further questions for future research and study.

The first of the additional analyses performed correlated the dollar amount allocated to institutions, and the percentage of state budgets of which these allocations comprised. Table 20 reflects this data, showing the average state allocation totaling $232,612,000. Like previous tables, a negative correlation was found, thus indicating the larger the dollar value, the smaller the percentage of the budget allocated. However, the variance in allocated dollars was responsible for only .05% of the variance in the percentage of state budgets.

Table 20.

Correlation of State Funding and State Budget Percent
N=30

	State Funding for Institution (thousands)	% State Budget
Mean	232,612	2.01%
Variance	15,348,080,828	1.59
Standard Deviation	123,887	1.26
$r = -0.073$		
$r^2 = 0.005$		

Table 21 indicates a positive direction associated between state funding dollars and institutional share of state higher education budget. Statistically, a higher dollar amount allocated to an institution was more likely to be indicative of a larger share allocated from the state higher education budget. Again, $r^2=0.026$ indicates a weak correlation.

Table 21.

Correlation of State Funding and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	State Funding for Institution (thousands)	% State HIED Budget
Mean	232,612	17.6%
Variance	15,348,080,828	145
Standard Deviation	123,887	12.0
$r = 0.163$		
$r^2 = 0.026$		

The following table (Table 22) depicts a strong positive correlation between the two dependent variables analyzed for the research questions. Unlike previous results, there appeared to be a possible relationship between the variables. The correlation coefficient suggested that 52.4% of the variability in an institution's share of its state's higher education budget was associated with the variability of its share of the total state budget. Specifically, the higher the percentage of its state's budget an institution receives, the larger the share allocated from its state's higher education budget.

Table 22.

Correlation of State Funding Percent and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	% State Budget	% State HIED Funding
Mean	2.01	17.6%
Variance	1.59	145
Standard Deviation	1.26	12.0
$r = 0.724$		
$r^2 = 0.524$		

Another external variable that may be considered is population size (United States Census Bureau, 2006). Data in Table 23 indicated a positive correlation between the population of a state, and the portion of a state's budget allocated to the institution. Statistically, larger portions of state budgets are allocated to institutions whose states maintain larger populations. According to the analysis, however, less than half (43.8%) of the variability in state budget share was linked with the variability in state population size.

Table 23.

Correlation of State Population and State HIED Budget Percent
=30

	State Population (millions)	% State Budget
Mean	11.9	2.01%
Variance	52.24	1.59
Standard Deviation	7.22	1.26
r = 0.662		
$r^2 = 0.438$		

Although r^2 in Table 24 was substantially lower from that in Table 23, the correlation between state population and share of state higher education budget was positive. As a result, it was inferred that an increase in state population generally leads to an increase in the share of a state's higher education budget an institution receives.

Table 24.

Correlation of State Population and State HIED Budget Percent
N=30

	State Population (millions)	% State HIED Budget
Mean	11.9	17.6%
Variance	52.2	145
Standard Deviation	7.22	12.0
r = 0.412		
$r^2 = 0.17$		

Chapter Summary

Chapter 4 summarized the study, shared results of the survey, offered data analysis, and answered the research questions. Findings included personnel structure of government relations offices, and, fiscal data for the institutions and states in which they serve. Differences among government relations offices were analyzed as were those concerning state funding.

On average, major public institutions of higher learning receive $232,612,000 in state funding. Proportionally, this comprised 2.01% of states' total budgets, and a 17.6% share of states' higher education budgets. Regarding personnel size, slightly less than six staff members were employed in government relations office. Of these six, about four were professional staff personnel while the remaining two usually consisted of administrative and office-support staff.

Regarding personnel structure, on average 3.77 staff members were charged with conducting or assisting with state relations responsibilities, while 2.76 of these were responsible for fulfilling state relations duties and no other. As it pertained to professional staff, an average 2.25 assisted with state relations duties, of which 1.8 were solely obligated to executing state relations responsibilities.

The study determined that a mostly negative correlation existed when examining the seven independent variables with the two dependent variables. In other words, the trend indicated that smaller government relations offices tended to receive a larger share of state budgets and state higher education budgets. The exception to this rule lied in the correlation analysis examining the relationship between the percentage of higher education budget allocated and the number of professionals on staff contributing to state

relations duties. Otherwise, the analyses indicated a statistically inverse relationship. In addition, the correlation coefficient calculated for each analysis addressing the research questions indicated a very weak likelihood that the variability in the dependent variables was associated with the variability in the independent variables.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

As public funding for state colleges and universities declines (Potter, 2003), it is imperative that institutions maximize internal resources to generate revenue. One area for innovation is the structure of government relations offices. Given their responsibility for communicating to policymakers the need for public investment in higher education, government relations personnel play a key role in developing financial support. The number of staff employed in an office combined with the assignment of specific responsibilities offer integral variables to be considered by administrators when developing a government relations strategy. With the scramble for public resources becoming increasingly competitive among public institutions of higher learning, it is advisable for colleges and universities to implement creative and efficient measures allowing for meaningful and effective relationship-building with legislators (Quillian, 2005).

Competing demands for state resources will continue to take its toll on available funding for higher education (Jones, 2003; Kane & Orszag, 2003). With the demand for public resources soaring, states will be forced to make difficult decisions concerning allocations to publicly-financed colleges. Increased funding for K-12 reforms, Medicaid claims, infrastructure improvements, and civil defense equates to smaller shares of states' general funds left for postsecondary institutions (Trombley, 2003). Not helping matters, public perception generally views higher education as a consumer product; therefore, it is widely believed funding should be provided largely by those who directly subscribe to its services (Harvey & Immerwahr, 1995). Confirmed by Melton (2002), higher education

leaders are charged with a rigorous challenge to persuade lawmakers that higher education is a viable expenditure in light of vying interests and less than favorable public opinion. This chapter provides a summary of the study, presentation of conclusions, possible recommendations, and a discussion of the relevance of the study as it pertains to future research. The chapter concludes with a summary of the items presented in Chapter 5.

Summary of the Study

The purpose for conducting the study was to determine the extent a relationship exists between personnel structure in university government relations offices and the share of state funding an institution receives. The study centered on major public research universities designated as peer institutions by the University of Arkansas. Specifically, personnel size and type serving in government relations roles within these institutions were the focus of the research.

Survey administration was the method of research selected for data collection. The survey instrument was developed to retrieve information focusing on the number of individuals serving in a government relations office as well as the duties performed by such personnel. The survey provided multiple choice options through which questions could be answered; however, space was allowed for participants to provide for further clarification of their responses if applicable. Specifically, the inquiries prompted respondents to indicate the number of full-time and part-time professional and administrative personnel responsible for federal, state, and/or local government relations duties. Toward ensuring accuracy, relevance, and demographics of the data respondents were asked to indicate the institution they represent, the institution's association, if any,

with external representation (contracted lobbyists), and the constituent represented by the government relations office (institution, university system, or otherwise).

Fifty-five institutions were selected for the online survey. The population was drawn from the list of peer institutions provided in the University of Arkansas strategic plan (University of Arkansas 2010 Commission, 2001). A lead government relations official from each institution was contacted via electronic mail to complete the survey. Exactly 30 respondents chose to complete the survey request.

The survey was designed to answer five research questions. The first question was devoted to addressing the organizational structure of government relations offices. The second question examined the correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and the share of a state's budget an institution receives. In question three relationships were analyzed as it concerned the organizational structure of a government relations office and the share of a total state's budget the institution receives. Questions four and five follow the patterns of questions two and three; however, the dependent variable is modified to examine the share of state higher education budgets allocated to institutions, rather than shares of overall state budgets.

The first research question intended to determine the organizational structures of government relations offices in major public research institutions. Based on the information provided, a typical government relations office represents an individual institution as opposed to a university system. Additionally, it retains both state and federal relations responsibilities while employing slightly less than six staff members. This usually consists of four professionals and two office support staff members. Of the four professionals, two are responsible for carrying out state relations duties. However,

nearly half of professional and administrative staff is responsible for fulfilling only state relations duties.

The second research question inquired as to the extent a correlation exists between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund. Using a Pearson product-moment correlation analysis, results concluded that a negative correlation exists between the two variables. Statistically, the percentage of a state's general fund allocated to an institution increases as the personnel size of a government relations office decreases. However, the analysis also concluded the data does not support the likelihood of a causal relationship. These trends hold true for associated variables. The percentage of funding received maintains a negative statistical correlation with not only the total number of overall staff, but also total staff performing state relations functions and total staff performing only state relations functions.

The third research question intended to determine the extent to which a correlation exists between the organizational structure of a government relations office and its institution's share of the state's budget. Again, using a Pearson product-moment correlation analysis a negative correlation and a weak causal relationship is observed. The percentage of a state's budget devoted to an institution is larger for institutions who maintain smaller numbers of specific personnel. In further detail, the percentage of funding maintains a negative correlation with the following variables: professional staff, support staff, professional staff performing state relations functions, and professional staff performing only state relations duties.

The fourth research question examined the correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and the percentage of a state's higher education budget allocated to its institution. Like the results from the previous research questions, the correlation is negative and the strength of relationship between the variables is nearly non-existent. Parallel with the second research question the share of a state's higher education budget is increased, statistically, for government relations offices that not only maintain smaller staff sizes, but also maintain less staff performing state relations functions as well as staff performing only state relations functions.

The fifth and final research question sought to address the correlation between the organizational structure of a government relations office and the percentage of a state's higher education budget allocated to its institution. Unlike the previous three research questions, it appears that a positive correlation is calculated when analyzing one of the variables tested. Although a negative correlation exists when performing an analysis concerning the total number of professional staff, support staff, and professional staff performing only state relations duties, a positive correlation occurs when factoring the total number of professional staff engaging in state relations duties. Thus, statistically, a higher percentage of state higher education budgets are awarded to institutions who maintain a larger professional staff assisting with state relations responsibilities. Nevertheless, a weak causal relationship is determined from the Pearson analysis.

The trend appears to result in a statistically inverse effect, as shares of state funding allocations tend to be higher for institutions whose government relations offices maintain smaller personnel support. The exception to this rule involves the employment of professionals who help with state relations duties. Nevertheless, as this research is

intended to help provide a foundation for future analysis in this field, it is expected that the data provided from these findings will help lay the foundation for further examination in this field of study.

Conclusions

1. The majority of government relations offices (70%) at major public research institutions represent the institution only, and not an entire university system. As well, a majority of government relations offices (76%) are responsible for conducting state and federal relations duties. Only 1 in 5 is charged with conducting state relations duties without fulfilling federal relations responsibilities.
2. Based on the findings, an average 5.84 individuals serve in government relations offices. The average professional staff size is 3.77, of which on average 67.6% contribute to state relations responsibilities. In addition, 47.7% of professionals in each office focus on state relations alone. Administrative and office support personnel comprise 27.9% of staff serving in a government relations office.
3. Only 24% of government relations staff is responsible for fulfilling federal relations responsibilities. Of all government relations offices who participated in the study, only 14% carry out duties for more than one level of government relations (i.e. federal, state, and/or local government).
4. Of government relations professionals, only 14% fulfill responsibilities relating to multiple levels of government. Regarding administrative staff, less than 25% assist with combined levels of government relations.

5. Almost half (48%) of all professionals are responsible for state relations alone. This is parallel with administrative staff, of which 49% fulfill only state relations functions. The next most prevalent area(s) of responsibility is that designated solely to federal relations responsibilities, as 27% and 18% of all professional and administrative personnel (respectively) carry out duties in this area.
6. Statistically, institutions who employed fewer personnel serving in government relations roles often received larger proportions of total appropriations allocated from state budgets, including larger portions of state higher education budgets. This trend is applicable when examining the number of: total staff, all staff sharing state relations duties, staff devoted only to state relations duties, professional staff, support staff, and professional staff assigned only to state relations responsibilities. No causal relationships appear to exist between personnel and state funding.
7. The percentage of a state's overall budget allocated to an institution shares a statistical tendency to be smaller when greater numbers of professional personnel are employed to assist with state relations duties. However, trend analysis indicates the percentage of a state's higher education budget allocated to an institution increases when more professional personnel in government relations offices contribute to state relations responsibilities.
8. On average, the institutions surveyed received $232,612,000 in state funding. The average allocation equates to 2.01% of state budgets and 17.6% of state higher education budgets. According to the Pearson-product moment correlation analysis, the percentage of a total budget awarded to an institution tends to be lower in states whose schools are allocated larger dollar amounts. Conversely, the percentage of a

state's higher education budget appropriated to an institution appears to be larger when the dollar amount is increased.

9. The percentage of a state's higher education budget awarded to an institution is increased when the percentage of the overall budget awarded is increased. The correlation confirms over 50% of the variability in the two variables is associated.
10. The average state population of the institutions participating in the survey is 11.9 million. From a statistical perspective, larger shares of a state's general funds and state higher education budgets are allocated to institutions residing in states with larger populations.

Recommendations

The highest expectation for the survey results included compiling a complete dataset upon receipt from all institutions whose participation was requested. Although more than half of the population responded, it would be advantageous for future studies to mandate receipt of responses from all major public research institutions prior in order to warrant a more thorough analysis. Doing so could enable a correlation of variables representative of institutions who may share government relations strategies different from those in this study, or, institutions that may be subjected to unique state funding formulas, policies, and/or priorities.

Regarding survey results, it appears that institutions with fewer government relations personnel are more likely to have a larger share of state budgets as well as state higher education budgets. Future studies may want to consider exploring variables peripheral to the study, such as state population and intrastate competition. For instance,

institutions with a smaller government relations staff may gain a larger portion of state budgets where state populations are smaller. Generally, budgets are smaller within states with fewer residents. As a result, a more proportional impact can be levied on budgets without the level of expenditures made in larger states. Additionally, a closer observation may be necessary for institutions who may share a state with one or more institutions surveyed. With multiple universities competing for resources from the same government, the percentage of a budget allocated could be adversely affected.

Another consideration to be taken under advisement is the need for public funding. Many institutions may not be as reliant on state funding either because the tuition of a large student population may offset the need, or, a small student population may not require as great a demand for financing. Future surveys of government relations officers could include inquiries regarding the student population of their respective institutions. Not only could trends be analyzed regarding the structure of government relations personnel at institutions with varying enrollment sizes, trends could be observed regarding enrollment size and budget share.

The purpose of the aforementioned recommendations is to preserve the focus on improving the effectiveness of government relations offices. The intent is to search not for random institutional trends and their relationship to state funding, but rather the internal or external elements that may directly or indirectly enable government relations offices to more effectively influence state funding. With no department on a college campus as responsible for building rapport with state legislators, it is relevant continuous evaluation and feedback be provided by higher education practitioners directly relating to

government relations personnel, organizational structure, and strategies for relationship-building with public policy leaders.

Discussion

A majority of the study's findings suggest the personnel size and structure share very little, if any, causal effect on funding levels. Nevertheless, the statistical correlations leave more research to be desired. With higher percentages of state budgets and state higher education budgets allocated to institutions with fewer government relations personnel, an explanation of this trend is delegated to future investigation. Further exploration may lead to a discovery of trends or elements associated with government relations offices that may serve as predictors for state funding of higher education institutions. Such predictors would maintain not only a consistent statistical correlation with state funding variables, but also prove to be a likely causal effect for funding levels.

However, additional analyses not directly associated with the research questions suggest that further study should be completed to explain the negative correlation between personnel size and structure, and, portions of funding received. For instance, larger monetary allocations account for smaller shares of state budgets; conversely, they also account for larger shares of state higher education budgets. Furthermore, it appears state funding and higher education funding share a strong correlation and relationship. As the portion of total state budgets allocated to institutions increases, the portion allocated from state higher education budgets also increases. Additionally, utilizing state population as a variable or predictor may or may not be applicable, given that the analyses reflect a positive correlation between population size and funding portions.

In short, it cannot be assumed that smaller government relations offices account for greater shares of resources. Likewise it cannot be assumed that larger offices account for less. Although statistical correlations indicate as much, further analysis should be conducted that includes variables such as: actual dollar amounts, intrastate public higher education competition, state funding laws and policies, etc. For example, knowing that institutions in more populated states receive a smaller percentage of the overall state and higher education budgets (Tables 5 and 6), further study of funding regulations should be conducted in lieu of the correlation analysis indicating the existence of a positive direction between population size and funding portions (Tables 29 and 30). Performing additional in-depth analyses such as this would not only add to this collection of data, it could also help provide further explanation of the results from the research questions.

This study is intended to contribute to a foundation for future research concerning government relations operations in the higher education sector. The long-term purpose of the research is not solely to establish baseline data for future studies, but to foster curiosity stemming from its findings. From the questions that may evolve from this analysis, perhaps it can be decided whether a preferred method or formula exists for structuring a government relations office. With the cost to provide and purchase a college education continuing to escalate, it is increasingly incumbent on or upon administrators to develop effective strategies that maximize an institution's potential to secure resources. Although the study was not designed to determine causal relationships, the results may help provide a starting point from which future examination of the topic may be surveyed, and from which government relations offices may be constructed in the future.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 5 concluded the study by summarizing the results of the five research questions. Ten conclusions were reached as it pertains to higher education government relations personnel and the share of state funding allocated to institutions. The conclusions also provided nominal fiscal and personnel data. Most findings of the survey suggest a negative correlation between the variables tested. However, the strength of relationship between the variables is minimal if not non-existent. In lieu of this various recommendations were provided for further research on this topic, specifically as it pertains to potential independent variables. A brief discussion was offered regarding the purpose and applicability of the study. The chapter concluded by emphasizing the importance of continued research in the area of government relations, including its influence in higher education funding processes.

References

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006). *Public policy agenda 2006*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2005). *Renewing the promise: The public's universities in a transforming world.* Washington, DC: Author.

Alexander, F. K. (2004). Comparative study of state tax effort and the role of federal government policy in shaping revenue reliance patterns. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 119,* 13-25. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No: 02710579)

Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2006). State higher education spending and the tax revolt. *Journal of Higher Education, 77*(4), 618-644. Retrieved July, 7, 2007, from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 00221546)

Arnone, M. (2004). State spending on colleges drops for the first time in eleven years. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*(19), A24-A27.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L .C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. (2006). *Introduction to research in education.* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Berman, E. M. (2002). *Essential statistics for public managers and policy analysts.* Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.

Brooke, B. T. (1993). Public perceptions of higher education. *Oxford Review of Education, 19*(1), 47-64.

Brooks, R. (2005). Measuring university quality. *The Review of Higher Education, 29*(1), 1-21.

Brown, P. E. (1985). The organization and management of state-level lobbying efforts of different types of institutions of higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1985). Retrieved June 16, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database (Publication No. AAT 8608515)

Callan, P.M. (2001). Coping with recession. Paper presented at the Forum for the Future of Higher Education, Aspen, CO. In M. Devlin & J.W. Meyerson (Eds.) *Forum Futures: Exploring the Future of Higher Education.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Connick, G. P. (Fall 1997). Issues and trends to take us into the twenty-first century. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 71,* 7-12. Retrieved July 14, 2007, from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 02710633.

Cook, C. E. (2004). The arrival of the 104th Congress. In C. E. Cook (Ed.), *Lobbying for Higher Education: How colleges and universities influence federal policy* (pp.53-63).

Cook, C.E. (1998*). Lobbying for higher education.* Vanderbilt University Press: Nashville.

Couturier, L. & Scurry, J. (2005). Correcting course: How we can restore the ideals of public higher education in a market-driven era. Futures Project: Policy for Higher Education in a Changing World. Providence, RI: The Futures Project
.

Cross, J. F. (2004). The impact of college and university faculty collective bargaining on state appropriations to public higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2004). Retrieved June 16, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database (Publication No. AAT 3130904)

Democratic Staffs of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions; Senate Subcommittee on Education Appropriations; House Committee on Education and the Workforce; and the House Committee on Appropriations. (2002, May). *Slamming shut the doors to college: The state budget crisis and higher education.* Author. Retrieved July 8, 2007 from: http://edworkforce.house .gov/democrats/higheredreport.pdf

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Rizzo, R. G. (2004). Financial forces and the future of American higher education. *Academe, 90*(4), 28-31. Retrieved July 14, 2007 from ProQuest Research Library database (Document ID: 674044531)

Fischer, K. (2006, January 13). State spending on colleges bounce back. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(19). 1.

Geiger, R. L. (2005). The ten generations of American higher education. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, and P. J. Gumpty (Eds.), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 38-70). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Geiger, R. L. (2000). Introduction: New themes in the history of nineteenth-century colleges. In R. L. Geiger (Ed.), *The American College in the Nineteenth Century.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Gianneschi, M. E. (2004). The effect of changes in state appropriations on voluntary giving to state supported universities. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arizona, 2005). Retrieved July 8, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database (Publication No. AAT 3132222)

Given, L. M., & Olson, H. A. (2003). Knowledge organization in research: a conceptual model for organizing data. *Library and Information Science Research, 25*(2) 157-176.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K.D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology.* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Shuster.

Gray, G. (2000, January 5). Will my college education get me a Porsche, or just a BMW? *Christian Science Monitor, 92*(29), 15. Retrieved June 9, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No.08827729)

Hale, S. (2006). Widening participation, equalizing opportunity? Higher education's mission impossible. *Politics, 26*(2), 93-100.

Harvey, J., & Immerwahr, J. (1995). Public perceptions of higher education: On main street and in the boardroom. *Educational Record, 76*(4), 51-56.

Hebel, S., & Selingo, J. (2001, April 20). For public colleges, a decade of generous state budgets is over. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(32). Retrieved July 7, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 00095982)

Hebel, S. (2003, June 20). To ease budget crunch, public universities seek freedom from state controls. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(41). A19.

Henson, M., & Raiti, H. (2003). Trickle-down cuts. *AFT On Campus, 5*(1). Retrieved July 8, 2007 from http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/on_campus/2003/sep/feature.htm

Hicock, E. W. (2006, March 10). Higher education needs reform, too. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(27), B48-B49.

Ikenberry, S. O. (March 2001). Higher education and market forces. *USA Today Magazine, 129*(2670). Retrieved June 9, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 01617389)

Ikenberry, S. O. (2005, November). American higher education: The new balancing act. Paper presented at the meeting of the TIAA-CREF Institute Conference, New York, New York. In R. L. Clark & M. d'Ambrosio (Eds.) *The New Balancing Act in the Business of Higher Education Conference Volume: TIAA-CREF Institute Series on Higher Education.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing (2006). Retrieved March 9, 2006 from http://www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/research/articles/030106.htm

Immerwahr, J. (2004). Public attitudes on higher education: A trend analysis, 1993-2003. *The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and Public Agenda*. Retrieved from March 7, 2007 from http://www.highereducation.org/ reports/pubatt/

Immerwahr, J. (2002). The affordability of higher education: A review of recent survey research. *The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and Public Agenda*. (pp.4-5). Retrieved March 7, 2007 from http://www. highereducation..org/reports/affordability_pa/affordability_pa.shtml

Johnstone, D. B. (2005). Financing higher education: Who should pay? In P.G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, and P.J. Gumpoty (Eds.), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century* (pp.369-392). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Jones, D. (2003). State shortfalls projected throughout the decade. *Policy Alert*. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Retrieved July 7, 2007 from http://www.higheredinfo.org

Kane, T. J., & Orszag, P. R. (2003). Higher education spending: The role of Medicaid and the business cycle. *The Brookings Institution Policy Brief,* 124. Retrieved March 10, 2007 from thttp://www.brook.edu/comm/policybriefs/pb124.htm

Kane, T. J. & Orszag, P. R. (2004). Financing public higher education: Short-term and long-term challenges. *Ford Policy Forum 2004*. Cambridge, MA: Forum for the Future of Higher Education.

Kane, T. J., & Orszag, P. R., & Apostolov, E. (2005). Higher education appropriations and public universities: Role of Medicaid and the business cycle. *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs,6,* 99-146. (Retrieved July 8, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No.15287084)

Kirwan, W. E. (2005, November). Higher education: Meeting today's challenges and regaining the public's trust. Paper presented at the meeting of the TIAA-CREF Institute Conference, New York, New York. In R. L. Clark & M. d'Ambrosio (Eds.) *The New Balancing Act in the Business of Higher Education Conference Volume: TIAA-CREF Institute Series on Higher Education.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing (2006). Retrieved March 9, 2006 from http://www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/ research/articles/030106.html

Lemaitre, M.J. (2002). Quality as politics. *Quality in Higher Education, 8*(1), 29-37.

Longanecker, D. (2005, November). Money for something – but what? Paper presented at the meeting of the TIAA-CREF Institute Conference, New York, New York. In R. L. Clark & M. d'Ambrosio (Eds.) *The New Balancing Act in the Business of Higher Education Conference Volume: TIAA-CREF Institute Series on Higher Education.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

MacTaggart, T. J. (2004). The ambiguous future of public higher education systems. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Malveaux, J. (2004). Will tuition become a campaign issue? *Black Issues in Higher Education, 21*(11), 39.

Manzo, K. M. (2006, March 27). Report: Budget optimism doesn't translate into more state funding for higher education. *Community College Week, 10*, 12-15.

Martinez, M. C., Farias, J., & Arellano, E. (2002). State higher education report cards: What's in a grade? *The Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 1-18.

McLendon, M. K., Heller, D. E., & Young, S. P. (2005). State postsecondary policy innovation: Politics, competition, and the interstate migration of policy ideas. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(4), 363-400.

Melton, P. B. (2002). Shifting political dynamics: An uncertain political and economic climate poses new challenges to the future of higher education. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 19*(21), 30-31. Retrieved April 7, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 07420277)

Murphy, E. P. (2001). Effective lobbying strategies for higher education in state legislatures as perceived by government relations officers. (Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 2001). Retrieved July 8, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database (Publication No. AAT 3223322)

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. (2004). *The educational pipeline: Big investment, big returns.* Retrieved July 10, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.highereducation.org/reports/pipeline/

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2004). *State Budget Actions, 2003.* Appendices E, J, K, L, N. Denver, CO: Author.

National Education Association Higher Education Research Center. (2003). Why are college prices increasing and what should we do about it? *Update, 9*(5), 3.

National Governor's Association and the National Association of State Budget Officers. (2007, June). *The Fiscal Survey of States.* Washington, DC: Author.

Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The future of higher education: Rhetoric, reality, and the risks of the market.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer., J. C. (Ed.). (2007). *State reports for fiscal year 2006-07.* Grapevine: An annual compilation of data on state tax appropriations for the general operation of higher

education. Retrieved July 10, 2007, from hhttp://www.grapevine.ilstu.edu/statereports/FY07/web/index.htm

Pan, S. (1998). The future of higher education – a conference report. *Telos, 111,* 12-14. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No.00906514).

Peerless, M. (n.d.) History of higher education finance reforms in America. Retrieved March 11, 2007 from http://www.gwu.edu/~gjackson/peerless.PDF

Potter, W. (2003, August 8). State lawmakers again cut higher-education spending bill. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(48). A48.

Quillian, B. (2005, November). Regaining the trust in higher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the TIAA-CREF Institute Conference, New York, New York. In R. L. Clark & M. d'Ambrosio (Eds.) *The New Balancing Act in the Business of Higher Education Conference Volume: TIAA-CREF Institute Series on Higher Education.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing (2006). Retrieved March 9, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/research/articles/030106.html

Richardson, Jr., B. C., Bracco, K. R. Callan, & Finney, J. E. (1998). Higher education governance: Balancing institutional and market influences. *National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.* San Jose, CA. Retrieved July 8, 2007 from http://www.highereducation.org/reports/governance/governance4.shtml

Smith, C. A. (1990). *Political communication.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Smith, M. F. (2004). Growing expenses, shrinking resources: The states and higher education. *Academe, 90*(4), 32. Retrieved April 7, 2007 from ProQuest Research Library database (Document ID: 674044551)

Trombley, W. (2003). College affordability in higher education: The rising price of higher education. *National Crosstalk, 11*(1), 1A.

Toppo, G. (2005). Is college getting out of reach? *USA Today.* Retrieved April 7, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (Accession No. J0E064958570905)

United States Census Bureau (2006). US Census Bureau Factfinder database. Washington: Author. Retrieved October 2, 2007 from http://factfinder.census.gov

University of Arkansas 2010 Commission. (2001). *Making the case: The impact of the University of Arkansas on the future of the state of Arkansas.* Fayetteville, AR: Author.

Ward, D. (2004). Can higher education use public opinion to shape debates? *Presidency, 7*(2), 9-10.

Wellman, J. V. (2002). *Weathering the double whammy*. Retrieved July 7, 2007 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service (No. EJ650753)

Wicker, T. (1994). End of an affair. *Change*, *26*(3), 27-29. Retrieved March 11, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 00091383)

Zemsky, R. (2003). Have we lost the 'public' in higher education? *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(38). B7-B9.

Zhang, L. (2003). *Public college quality and higher education policies of U.S. states*. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford Institute for Economic Policy and Research. Retrieved April 7, 2007 from http://siepr.stanford.edu/papers/pdf/03-13.pdf

Zumeta, W. (2002). Higher education in the states: Teetering on the brink once again. *The NEA 2002 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Zumeta, W. (2001). Higher education finance in the nineties: Lessons for the new millennium. *The NEA 2001 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In P.G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, and P.J. Gumport (Eds.), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 25 PEER INSTITUTIONS

Table 25.

Peer Institutions

Institution
Arizona State University
Auburn University
Clemson University
Colorado State University
Florida State University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Indiana University
Iowa State University
Kansas State University
Louisiana State University and A&M College
Michigan State University
Mississippi State University
North Carolina State University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University

(table continues)

Table 25. (continued)

Peer Institutions

Institution
Texas A & M University
Texas Tech University
University of Alabama
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of California-Berkeley
University of California-Los Angeles
University of Colorado
University of Connecticut
University of Delaware
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts

(table continues)

Table 25. (continued)

Peer Institutions

Institution
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Mississippi
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
University of North Carolina
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Rhode Island
University of South Carolina
University of Tennessee
University of Texas
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Washington State University
West Virginia University

APPENDIX B

REQUESTS FOR SURVEY PARTICIPATION

From: Randall W. Brumfield

To:

Sent: August 22, 2007

Subject: Government Relations Inquiry

Dear Government Relations Professional:

I am writing to request your participation in a dissertation research study. The purpose for conducting the study is to identify the relationship between state government funding and the organizational structure of government relations offices at public institutions of higher education. Your responses, or those of a colleague you may designate, will be held in strictest confidence, and only group data will be reported.

Your institution's participation in the study is requested, and is very important. Please take no more than three to five (3-5) minutes to complete the multiple choice survey located via the web link below. If possible, I would encourage you to respond by the Labor Day holiday (09/03/2007). Again, your participation is essential to the study, but entirely voluntary; however, should you or a designee choose to participate the responses will be held in strictest confidence.

I hope that you will decide to participate in this study, and I will provide you with an executive summary of the study findings upon its completion. Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at _____ or via electronic mail at _____. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact _____, the University's Compliance Coordinator, at _____ or via electronic mail at _____.

Sincerely,

Randall W. Brumfield
Doctoral Candidate
Higher Education Leadership
University of Arkansas

Survey Weblink: _____

From: Randall W. Brumfield

To:

Sent: September 4, 2007

Subject: FW: Government Relations Inquiry

Dear (Name),

I hope this letter finds you well, and that the new school year at _____ has begun on a positive note. As of now I am attempting to complete a dissertation study on government relations offices at universities identified as peer institutions by the University of Arkansas strategic plan. To assist with this, I am hoping you (or a trusted colleague) could respond to the survey via weblink at: _____.

The questionnaire consists of seven questions, with six of those requiring responses. Of those six, all are multiple choice. The length of time to complete the survey should not exceed more than a couple minutes.

With that said if you have any questions or concerns please feel free to reach me during the day at _____, or, by e-mail at _____.

On that note, I offer many thanks for your consideration. Again, I look forward to providing you with an executive summary of the findings once the study is complete.

Sincerely,

Randall Brumfield
Doctoral Candidate
Higher Education Leadership
University of Arkansas

APPENDIX C

ONLINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Online Survey Questionnaire (Document Format)

Higher Education Government Relations Questionnaire

Questions with asterisks will require a response. Although Questions 6 and 7 are not noted with asterisks, please respond where applicable. If there is additional information you would like to share there will be space available at the end of the survey to do so. Again, thank you for your participation.

*1. Which institution does your Government Relations office serve?

*2. Who is PRIMARILY responsible for conducting Government Relations on behalf of your institution?
Government Relations Staff (represents institution only)
University System (representing all campuses within a university system)
Private Firm/Third Party
Other
If "Other", please specify:

*3. Your Government Relations office is charged with primarily representing the interests of the:
Institution
University System
Other
If "Other", please specify:

*4. What are the primary responsibilities of the Government relations office at your institution?
Federal, State, and Local
Federal and State (only)
Federal and Local (only)
State and Local (only)
Federal (only)
State (only)
Local (only)
Other
My institution/campus does not maintain a Government Relations office.
None of the above
If "Other", please specify:

5. If your institution does not have personnel whose duties are primarily dedicated to performing Government Relations responsibilities, who is/are responsible for conducting such responsibilities? If applicable, which level of government is/are the individual(s) responsible for communicating with (i.e. federal, state, and/or local)?

(*appendix continues*)

Appendix E. (continued)

6. Please indicate how your institution's Government Relations office maintains organizational divisions or personnel responsibilities dedicated to federal, state, and/or local/community relations. Please indicate the number of employees whose responsibilities are devoted to each category. PLEASE CONSIDER THIS AN INQUIRY FOR WHICH A RESPONSE IS RQUIRED. (Please do not include administrative and support staff. This will be addressed in Question #7.)

	Full-Time \ Part-Time Equivalent (if applicable)
Federal (only)	
State (only)	
Local (only)	
Federal & State (only)	
Federal & Local (only)	
State & Local (only)	
Federal, State, & Local	

7. Please indicate the number of administrative and support staff devoted to each category within your institution's Government Relations office. IF APPLICABLE, PLEASE CONSIDER THIS AN INQUIRY FOR WHICH A RESPONSE IS REQUIRED.

	Full-Time \ Part-Time Equivalent (if applicable)
Federal (only)	
State (only)	
Local (only)	
Federal & State (only)	
Federal & Local (only)	
State & Local (only)	
Federal, State, & Local	

8. If preferred, please feel free to provide a description of the organizational structure in your Government Relations office (including any external reporting lines leading to the college president or chancellor

9. Should there be additional comments or points of clarification that you would like to share please do so here. With that said your time and consideration towards completing this questionnaire have been greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL OF SURVEY

August 10, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Randall Brumfield Michael Miller
FROM:	Ro Windwalker IRB Coordinator
RE:	New Protocol Approval
IRB Protocol #:	07-08-021
Protocol Title:	*A Structural Analysis of Higher Education Government Relations Organizations and their Relationship to State Funding*
Review Type:	☒ EXEMPT ☐ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB
Approved Project Period:	Start Date: 8/10/07 Expiration Date: 8/9/08

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Compliance website (http://www.uark.edu/admin/rsspinfo/compliance/human-subjects/index.html). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

If you wish to make *any* modifications in the approved protocol, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 120 Ozark Hall, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

APPENDIX E

TABLE 26 ALLOCATIONS TO INSTITUTIONS AS PERCENTAGE OF STATE GENERAL FUND (FY2006-07 ESTIMATED)

Table 26.

Allocations to Institutions as Percentage of State General Fund (FY 2006-07)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	**State General Fund (estimate) (*millions*)	Allocation as % of General Fund
Arizona State University	354,043	10,728	3.30%
Auburn University	167,011	8,555	1.95
Clemson University	100,476	7,417	1.35
Colorado State University	123,364[1]	7,869	1.56
Florida State University	281,188	32,081	0.87
Georgia Institute of Technology	212,078	21,377	0.99
Indiana University	191,855	12,854	1.49
Iowa State University	183,798	5,600	3.28
Kansas State University	163,024	6,365	2.56
Louisiana State University and A&M College	183,965	8,569	2.14
Michigan State University	292,186	9,225	3.16
Mississippi State University	90,518	4,402	2.05
North Carolina State University	306,279	19,913	1.53
Ohio State University	332,757	26,629	1.24
Oklahoma State University	123,311	6,262	1.96

(table continues)

[1] CSU allocations reported as system (includes Pueblo campus)

Table 26. (continued)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	**State General Fund (estimate) (*millions*)	Allocation as % of General Fund
Pennsylvania State University	327,715	26,367	1.24%
Purdue University	241,259	12,854	1.87
Texas A&M University	275,609	44,795	0.61
Texas Tech University	150,344	44,795	0.33
University of Alabama	171,299	8,555	2.00
University of Arizona	320,798	10,728	2.99
University of Arkansas	110,788	4,059	2.72
University of California-Berkeley	445,138	105,335	0.42
University of California-Los Angeles	562,475	105,335	0.53
University of Colorado	178,395	7,869	2.26
University of Connecticut	221,291	15,357	1.44
University of Delaware	113,098	3,960	2.85
University of Florida	362,747	32,081	1.13
University of Georgia	348,704	21,377	1.63
University of Illinois	341,025	29,083	1.17
University of Iowa	235,316[1]	5,600	4.20

(table continues)

[1] University of Iowa allocations include Primary Health Care.

Table 26. (continued)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	**State General Fund (estimate) (*millions*)	Allocation as % of General Fund
University of Kansas	145,004	6,365	2.27%
University of Kentucky	311,945	9,691	3.21
University of Maryland	370,869	14,387	2.57
University of Massachusetts	443,803	28,859	1.53
University of Michigan	325,796	9,225	3.53
University of Minnesota	619,579	18,062	3.43
University of Mississippi	70,406	4,402	1.59
University of Missouri	376,122[1]	8,515	4.41
University of Nebraska	207,705	3,629	5.72
University of North Carolina	488,678[2]	19,913	2.45
University of Oklahoma	136,334	6,262	2.17
University of Oregon	68,747[3]	7,105	0.96

(table continues)

[1] Although University of Missouri allocations are reported as 'system' allocation, multiple campuses do not exist, and health-related allocations are reported separately.

[2] UNC-Chapel Hill allocations reported as separate units in Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, and Area Health Education Center. This does not include UNC Hospitals.

[3] Data provided from Oregon University System 2006-07 Budget Report Summary, published by the OUS Chancellor's Office (p.8). General fund revenue is distributed to all state schools based on full-time enrollment and public service/research programs (p.22)

Table 26. (continued)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	**State General Fund (estimate) (*millions*)	Allocation as % of General Fund
University of Rhode Island	83,333	3,274	2.54%
University of South Carolina	148,113	7,417	1.99
University of Tennessee	181,357	10,998	1.64
University of Texas	316,406	44,795	0.70
University of Vermont	40,847	1,173	3.48
University of Virginia	174,857	18,243	0.95
University of Washington	341,161	14,823	2.30
University of Wisconsin	395,015[1]	13,187	2.99
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	174,857	18,243	0.95
Washington State University	194,063	14,823	1.30
West Virginia University	105,736	4,126	2.56

*Source (unless noted otherwise): Grapevine online database, Illinois State University.
**Source: NGA/NASBO, *The Fiscal Survey of States* (June2007).

[1] The University of Wisconsin-Madison does not directly receive state appropriations funding. Legislative funding is allocated to a university system, upon which a governing authority appropriates funding to individual UW campuses. At the time research was conducted, the Grapevine project did not offer specific data for the Madison campus. However, the U.S. Department of Education Integrated Postsecondary Education System offered state appropriations information for UW-Madison through the 2005-06 budget year. Given the biennial nature of Wisconsin's budget, it is presumed the 2005-06 budget would not significantly deviate from the 2006-07 budget, thus the 2005-06 data is used for this study.

APPENDIX F

TABLE 27 ALLOCATIONS AS PERCENTAGE OF STATE HIGHER EDUCATION BUDGET (FY2006-07 FINAL)

Table 27.

Allocations as Percentage of State Higher Education Expenditures (FY 2006-07)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	*State HIED Expenditures (*thousands*)	Allocation as % of State HIED Expenditures
Arizona State University	354,043	1,106,111	32.0%
Auburn University	167,011	1,670,508	9.99
Clemson University	100,476	859,360	11.6
Colorado State University	123,364[1]	680,407	18.1
Florida State University	281,188	3,525,639	7.97
Georgia Institute of Technology	212,078	2,208,459	9.60
Indiana University	191,855	1,457,164	13.1
Iowa State University	183,798	803,998	22.8
Kansas State University	163,024	788,720	20.6
Louisiana State University and A&M College	183,965	1,420,236	12.9
Michigan State University	292,186	2,074,370	14.0
Mississippi State University	90,518	904,205	10.0
North Carolina State University	306,279	3,373,636	9.07
Ohio State University	332,757	2,175,930	15.2
Oklahoma State University	123,311	956,464	12.8

(table continues)

[1]CSU allocations reported as system (includes Pueblo campus).

Table 27. (continued)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	*State HIED Expenditures (*thousands*)	Allocation as % of State HIED Expenditures
Pennsylvania State University	327,715	2,153,998	15.2%
Purdue University	241,259	1,457,164	16.5
Texas A&M University	275,609	5,457,578	5.05
Texas Tech University	150,344	5,457,578	2.75
University of Alabama	171,299	1,670,508	10.2
University of Arizona	320,798	1,106,111	29.0
University of Arkansas	110,788	785,273	14.1
University of California-Berkeley	445,138	10,842,321	4.10
University of California-Los Angeles	562,475	10,842,321	5.18
University of Colorado	178,395	680,407	26.2
University of Connecticut	221,291	883,116	25.0
University of Delaware	113,098	233,226	48.4
University of Florida	362,747	3,525,639	10.2
University of Georgia	348,704	2,208,459	15.7
University of Illinois	341,025	2,791,287	12.2
University of Iowa	235,316[1]	803,998	29.2

(table continues)

[1] University of Iowa allocations include Primary Health Care.

Table 27. (continued)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	*State HIED Expenditures (*thousands*)	Allocation as % of State HIED Expenditures
University of Kansas	145,004	788,720	18.3%
University of Kentucky	311,945	1,253,076	24.8
University of Maryland	370,869	1,436,393	25.8
University of Massachusetts	443,803	996,025	44.5
University of Michigan	325,79	2,074,370	15.7
University of Minnesota	619,579	1,400,500	44.2
University of Mississippi	70,406	904,205	7.78
University of Missouri	376,122[1]	878,337	42.8
University of Nebraska	207,705	571,047	36.3
University of North Carolina	488,678[2]	3,373,636	14.4
University of Oklahoma	136,334	956,464	14.2
University of Oregon	68,747[3]	650,066	10.5

(table continues)

[1] Although University of Missouri allocations are reported as 'system' allocation, multiple campuses do not exist, and health-related allocations are reported separately.

[2] UNC-Chapel Hill allocations reported as separate units in Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, and Area Health Education Center. This does not include UNC Hospitals.

[3] Data provided from Oregon University System 2006-07 Budget Report Summary, published by the OUS Chancellor's Office (p.8). General fund revenue is distributed to all state schools based on full-time enrollment and public service/research programs (p.22).

Table 27. (continued)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	*State HIED Expenditures (*thousands*)	Allocation as % of State HIED Expenditures
University of Rhode Island	83,333	184,466	45.1%
University of South Carolina	148,113	859,360	17.2
University of Tennessee	181,357	1,241,782	14.6
University of Texas	316,406	5,457,578	5.79
University of Vermont	40,847	85,217	47.9
University of Virginia	174,857	1,856,731	9.41
University of Washington	341,161	1,631,059	20.9
University of Wisconsin	395,015[1]	1,177,160	33.5
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	174,857	1,856,731	9.41
Washington State University	194,063	1,631,059	11.8
West Virginia University	105,736	387,211	27.3

*Source (unless noted otherwise): Grapevine online database, Illinois State University.

[1] The University of Wisconsin-Madison does not directly receive state appropriations funding. Legislative funding is allocated to a university system, upon which a governing authority appropriates funding to individual UW campuses. At the time research was conducted, Grapevine did not offer specific data for the Madison campus. However, the U.S. Department of Education Integrated Postsecondary Education System offered state appropriations information for UW-Madison through the 2005-06 budget year. Given the biennial nature of Wisconsin's budget, it is presumed the 2005-06 budget would not significantly deviate from the 2006-07 budget, thus the 2005-06 data is used for this study.

APPENDIX G

TABLES 28-29 OPTIONAL RESPONSES TO SURVEY

Table 28.

Optional Responses to Survey Question #8

Institution	Comment
1	Vice President of External Affairs: Federal Relations State Relations Local/Community Relations
5	The responsibility for State Governmental Relations (SGR) is shared by many in the institution and requires the collaboration of the President, the EVP/COO, the VP for Management and Budget, the Provost in addition to the dedicated SGR staff of 5.
6	Not reported above are the time of the Chancellor, Provost, and Dean of the Graduate School who go with me to D.C. once or twice a year to call on the [state's] congressional delegation.
9	I am responsible for state and federal relations. I report directly to the President of the University.
11	The Board of Regents has three State Relations Officers who are each assigned to one of the three state public universities. These three officers represent the entire system but are housed on the individual campuses and specialize in the state legislative issues related to that specific campus. All three are present at the State Capitol during the session. The three universities maintain their own lobbyists for federal affairs. The Board of Regents does not have federal relations officers.

(table continues)

Table 28. (continued)

Optional Responses to Survey Question #8

Institution	Comment
12	Head of Office, (Special Asst. to President for Govt. Affairs), lobbies and supervises 1 FT State Lobbyist, 1 FT Federal Lobbyist, and 1 FT State/Federal Lobbyist for the health Center. Three and ½ support staff serve these 4 lobbyists.
13	Exec. Dir. Of Public Affairs directly manages fed. gov. relations, with a hired consultant in Washington. State gov. relations reports to Exec. Dir. Of Public affairs and consists of a Director, Associate Director, and one support staff.
15	1 FT Director, reports to the President, responsible for oversight of the office, concentrates on state (95%) and local (5%). 1 FT Associate Director, reports to the Director, responsible for Federal .75 Assistant supports the director and Associate Director
16	Sole contributor; direct report to the President, dotted line to Advancement.
17	Assistant Vice Chancellor for overall supervision of 21 staff working at federal, State and local levels in addition to Advocacy and administrative staff that work with volunteers, personnel and payroll activities.

(table continues)

Table28. (continued)

Optional Responses to Survey Question #8

Institution	Comment
18	The Executive Director of Governmental Affairs reports directly to the President of the University.
19	Federal – former univ. employee who is now a contract [lobbyist]. State – university employee reports to the President.
20	We have a director of state government relations and a director of federal relations organized in a single government relations office. The state relations director serves as the director of the office for administrative purposes… but both directors work directly with the president.
21	Although the [University] System has four campuses [sic] all Government Relations activities are coordinated by the President and the board of Curators for the overall University, not individual campuses. As such, we report to the President of the System and carry out the Board's legislative priorities.
23	Asst. Vice Chancellor reports to Vice Chancellor of University Relations who reports to the Chancellor. Asst. Vice Chancellor for gov't affairs works with a half-time employee. He shares 1 administrative support person with 2 other people (0.33). 1 student worker (16hrs/wk).

(table continues)

Table 28. (continued)

Optional Responses to Survey Question #8

Institution	Comment
25	Has a system vice president for government relations with a director of state relations and a director of federal relations reporting to the vice president. Each campus within the system has a designated individual to coordinate with the government relations operations. State director is located in state capital, full time. federal director located in D.C., full time. In addition, federal office is represented by counsel.
26	We have a hybrid structure where the System office for governmental relations oversees the entire governmental relations function – including the university. However, the primary actor for this function is within the university. In other words, there are other governmental relations personnel in the System that work on university matter[s] too. But the focus and priorities are within the university. I, as a university employee, also have .25 of my time paid by the System so that I may be able to work on Systemwide (or statewide) issues if need be.

(table continues)

Table 28. (continued)

Optional Responses to Survey Question #8

Institution	Comment
27	[University] employs an Assistant Vice President for Governmental Relations, who report directly to the Vice President for University Relations, but has a dotted line to the President and Provost. The AVP's primary function is to lobby the state Legislature for institutional funding. She employs two full time support staff, and two ops positions. Federal relations are handled out of the Vice President for Research office, with a Director who is based out of the university [on campus], but travels frequently to DC. He has one full-time support staff [on campus]. The university also contracts several DC lobbyists to support the in-house efforts, and uses the [state university system] lobbyist in DC as well. Lobbying of the local government officials is handled on a case by case basis, between the Vice President for Finance and Administration, Vice President for University Relations and the President, as well as support from the AVP for Gov. Rel.
29	WE report to the President.
30	The Government Relations office, handling primarily state relations and some local government relations, reports to the president and the federal relations person reports to the VP of Research and, ultimately, the Provost. We work closely when appropriate, however

Table 29.

Optional Responses to Survey Question #9

Institution	Comment
1	Government Relations is important to [Institution 1]. The most important factor is the coordination of all the external units of the [institution]: Federal Relations, State Relations, Local Relations, Media Relations and Marketing all report to the Vice-Pres. of External Affairs and the individual offices overlap and add value to one another.
6	For federal relations, we retain a Washington, D.C. firm which assists us, along with other client institutions. That is the 20% on #5. The 10% on #5 is an assistant to the chancellor who assisted me on a part-time basis during the last legislative session.
8	We employee a contract firm to assist in both state and federal relations.
9	I am the only person working in federal and state relations at the institution. I have a full time staff assistant who works on both. I also teach a 3 hour undergraduate political science class.
12	We have not external contracts for lobbying services.